

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
Public Law 91-47
H. R. 11400

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 11400.....	1
Digest of Public Law 91-47.....	2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 11400

- Jan. 17, 1969 House received President's supplemental appropriations request. H. Doc. 91-50. Print of document.
- Mar. 4, 1969 House received President's proposed budget amendments and supplemental appropriation request. H. Doc. 91-85. Print of document.
- Mar. 27, 1969 House received President's proposed budget amendments and supplemental appropriation request. H. Doc. 91-94. Print of document.
- May 12, 1969 Senate received President's supplemental appropriation request. S. Doc. 91-19. Print of document.
- May 15, 1969 House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 11400, H. Rept. 91-252. Print of bill and report.
- May 20, 1969 H. Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 11400. H. Res. 414. H. Rept. 91-260. Print of resolution and report.
- House began debate on H. R. 11400.
- May 21, 1969 House passed H. R. 11400 with amendments.
- May 23, 1969 H. R. 11400 was referred to Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
- June 9, 1969 Senate subcommittee voted to report H. R. 11400 for full committee consideration.
- June 11, 1969 Senate committee reported H. R. 11400 with amendments. S. Rept. 91-228. Print of bill and report.
- June 12, 1969 H. R. 11400 was made unfinished business.
- June 16, 1969 Senate began debate on H. R. 11400.
- June 17, 1969 Senate continued debate on H. R. 11400.
- June 18, 1969 Senate continued debate on H. R. 11400.
- June 19, 1969 Senate passed H. R. 11400 with amendments. Senate conferees appointed.
- June 24, 1969 House conferees appointed.
- July 8, 1969 House received conference report on H. R. 11400. H. Rept. 91-356. Print of report.
- July 9, 1969 Senate received conference report on H. R. 11400. Both Houses agreed to conference report on H. R. 11400.
- July 22, 1969 Approved: Public Law 91-47. President's statement when signing H. R. 11400.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND
OTHER PROVISIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1968,
1969, AND 1970

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER PRO-
VISIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1968, 1969, AND 1970

JANUARY 17, 1969.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered
to be printed

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 17, 1969.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit for the consideration of the Congress proposed supplemental appropriations and other provisions for the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970 in the amounts of \$4,471,421,149 in budget authority, and \$403,423,000 in proposals not increasing budget authority. These requests, for all three branches of the Federal Government, were all taken into consideration in the budget I transmitted to the Congress on January 15, 1969.

The details of these proposals, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for their submission at this time are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., January 16, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations and provisions for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969, and a proposed amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1970, in the following amounts:

	Budget authority	Release of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other pro- posals not in- creasing budget authority
Legislative branch, 1969.....	11,554,315		
The judiciary, 1969.....	4,286,250		10,000
Executive branch:			
1968.....	7,168,000		
1969.....	4,448,312,584	152,072,000	201,061,000
1970.....	100,000		
Total:			
1968.....	7,168,000		
1969.....	4,464,153,149	152,072,000	201,071,000
1970.....	100,000		
District of Columbia funds, 1969.....			50,280,000

All of these requests were taken into account in the totals of the 1970 budget transmitted to the Congress on January 15, 1969. Accordingly, they will not cause the limitations established by Public Law 90-364 to be exceeded.

The requests are grouped in four titles:

TITLE I. MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Budget authority in the amount of \$1,631,500,000 for the Department of Defense is required to support our military operations in Southeast Asia. The requests include funds for the pay of military personnel, for operation and maintenance of equipment, and for procurement of items to replace combat losses. However, this request does not provide for increases to our current force levels or for expansion of our present efforts.

Supplemental requests for pay increase costs for the appropriation accounts included in title I are contained in titles II and III, discussed below.

TITLE II. OTHER PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR VARIOUS FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND 1969

Title II includes supplemental appropriation requests which are not due solely to increased pay costs. The latter are covered in title III. In some cases, additional funds or other provisions are needed for pay and for other purposes. In such cases, a combined request is shown under title II.

The following table summarizes amounts contained under title II:

	Budget authority	Release of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other pro- posals not in- creasing budget authority
The Judiciary, 1969-----	3, 892, 350		10, 000
Executive branch:			
1968-----	7, 168, 000		
1969:			
Pay increases-----	124, 403, 000	18, 326, 000	1, 628, 000
Other mandatory payments-----	1, 115, 511, 000		39, 000, 000
Natural disasters-----	31, 984, 000	1, 676, 000	
Uncontrollable workload and program increases-----	34, 259, 000		210, 000
Other proposals resulting from new legislation-----	17, 239, 000	87, 000	104, 500, 000
Other essential purposes-----	33, 198, 000	9, 350, 000	19, 050, 000
Total:			
1968-----	7, 168, 000		
1969-----	1, 360, 486, 350	29, 439, 000	164, 398, 000
District of Columbia funds, 1969-----			43, 842, 000

The 1968 request would provide \$7,168,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, to meet contractual requirements for annual contributions for low-rent public housing.

Mandatory payments for the fiscal year 1969 include, in addition to funds needed to meet the cost of civilian and military pay increases:

\$651,546,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for grants to States for maintenance payments and medical assistance. Latest estimates available from States indicate that funds already provided will not be enough to meet the required Federal share.

\$193,200,000 for the Veterans' Administration, mainly to pay for expanded and liberalized veterans benefits recently enacted by the Congress.

\$182,700,000 for the Department of Defense, primarily for increased mandatory payments to retired personnel.

\$47,100,000 for the Department of Labor, mainly for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.

\$39,000,000 to allow the Department of the Interior to liquidate obligations incurred as a result of land acquisition for the Redwood National Park.

Funds requested in connection with natural disasters would permit the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to meet the costs of forest and range fires, including emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands.

Requests for uncontrollable workload and program increases include: \$19,394,000 for the Veterans' Administration, for unanticipated medical care workload increases, increased travel, postal, and per diem rates, and for administering five recent laws affecting veterans programs.

\$7,000,000 for the Department of Defense, to cover costs of the earlier-than-anticipated release of Air National Guard units from active duty.

Proposals resulting from new legislation include:

\$11,161,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for a lump-sum payment in lieu of a land grant to the Federal City College, and for interest subsidy grants authorized by the Higher Education Amendments of 1968.

A \$100,000,000 increase in the limitation on the Department of Housing and Urban Development's total annual payments under contracts for assisting lower income families to acquire homes and suitable rental dwellings.

This title also includes requests for other essential purposes, including:

\$29,736,000 from Federal funds for the remainder of the authorized Federal payment to the District of Columbia, and for loans to the District to pay its share of 1969 construction costs of the rail rapid transit system.

\$9,350,000 in released reserves, to allow the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, through grants to State and local health departments, to help eradicate German measles.

An \$18,500,000 reprogramming of funds for the Department of Defense.

Title II also includes requests in the amount of \$43,842,000 from District of Columbia funds, primarily for construction costs of the rail rapid transit system, and for increased pay of teachers, policemen, and firemen.

TITLE III. INCREASED PAY COSTS

Title III contains requests for the remaining funds needed to accomplish the second phase, effective July 1, 1968, of the three-phase plan designed to increase Federal salary rates to full comparability with those paid in private industry.

These and related increases were ordered pursuant to law, as follows:

Section 205(a) of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-206, approved December 16, 1967) increased postal field service salary rates.

Executive Order 11413 of June 11, 1968, implemented section 212 of Public Law 90-206, which directed the President to adjust the salary rates of other civilian statutory salary systems by amounts equal to one-half the lag behind rates paid for similar work in private industry.

Executive Order 11414 of June 11, 1968, implemented section 8 of Public Law 90-207, which provided that whenever the rates of the General Schedule are adjusted upward, there must be a comparable upward adjustment in the basic pay of members of the uniformed services.

Actions by agency heads pursuant to law increased the pay of wage-board employees in line with prevailing rates (5 U.S.C. 5341(a)), and accomplished other salary adjustments through administrative action.

Public Law 90-319 of May 27, 1968, increased salaries of District of Columbia teachers and school officers.

Public Law 90-320 of May 27, 1968, increased salaries of District of Columbia policemen and firemen.

The total estimated cost for the fiscal year 1969 of the pay increases authorized as described above is \$2,069,861,261. This amount includes \$159,349,790 for related costs, such as the Government retirement contribution and employment taxes.

To cover the total cost of pay and related expenses, additional budget authority is requested in the amount of \$1,598,830,615—\$126,708,400 in title II and \$1,472,122,215 in this title. The difference, \$471,030,646 or nearly 25 percent, will be met from previously appropriated funds. Agencies other than the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department will absorb more than half of these costs. The Post Office will absorb 30 percent, and Defense 11 percent.

The absorption of \$471,030,646 in pay costs is proposed to be accomplished in three ways:

\$291,760,646 through administrative action.

\$140,959,000 through action by the Congress to release funds reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364.

\$38,311,000 through other actions by the Congress.

A total of \$28,477,000 in District of Columbia funds is also requested for pay increases for employees of the District.

Proposed general provisions relating to pay increases becoming effective on and after July 1, 1969, would serve two purposes:

They would permit funds to be apportioned on a deficiency basis to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases; and

They would permit funds to be made available for these pay increases should any Department or agency be operating after July 1, 1969, under a resolution providing continuing appropriations, pending enactment of their regular appropriation bills.

Provisions similar to these were included in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1968.

TITLE IV. COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

H.R. 10, 91st Congress, provides for an increase in the annual salary of the President of the United States—from \$100,000 to \$200,000. Title IV of this request would provide \$44,584 for the fiscal

year 1969, and \$100,000 for the fiscal year 1970 to carry out this legislation.

Where necessary, the appropriations of the agencies in the executive branch have been apportioned on a deficiency basis pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665). The actions have been or are being reported to the Congress.

I have carefully reviewed all the proposals for appropriations and other provisions contained in this document, and am satisfied that these requests are necessary at this time. I recommend that these proposals be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES J. ZWICK, *Director.*

SUMMARY OF ITEMS INCLUDED IN THE CONSOLIDATED
SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPRO-
PRIATIONS AND OTHER PROVISIONS

	Proposed budget authority	Proposed releases of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other pro- visions
Title I:			
Military operations in South- east Asia: 1969-----	\$1, 631, 500, 000	-----	-----
Title II:			
Other proposed appropriations for various programs:			
1968-----	7, 168, 000	-----	-----
1969:			
Pay increases-----	126, 708, 400	\$18, 326, 000	\$23, 677, 000
Other proposals-----	1, 233, 777, 950	11, 113, 000	184, 563, 000
Title III:			
Increased pay costs: 1969-----	1, 472, 122, 215	122, 633, 000	43, 111, 000
Title IV:			
Compensation of the President:			
1969-----	44, 584	-----	-----
1970-----	100, 000	-----	-----
Total:			
1968-----	7, 168, 000	-----	-----
1969:			
Pay increases-----	1, 598, 830, 615	140, 959, 000	66, 788, 000
Other proposals-----	2, 865, 322, 534	11, 113, 000	184, 563, 000
Total, 1969-----	4, 464, 153, 149	152, 072, 000	251, 351, 000
1970-----	100, 000	-----	-----

DETAIL OF PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1969

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Army", \$160,000,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Navy", \$25,300,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$6,500,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Air Force", \$150,400,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Army", \$152,400,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", \$24,300,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$282,200,000.

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army", \$727,800,000, to remain available until expended.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Aircraft procurement, Air Force", \$102,600,000, to remain available until expended.

These proposed supplemental appropriations are necessary to support our military operations in Southeast Asia. They include funds to pay a larger number of military personnel than was contemplated in the budget transmitted a year ago; and to procure items to replace combat losses. These requests do not contemplate an increase in force levels currently planned for Southeast Asia in 1969.

Proposed supplemental appropriations for increased pay costs for the above appropriations, where applicable, are contained in Titles II and III of this submission.

ITEMS INCLUDED IN TITLE II OF THE CONSOLIDATED
SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS,
RELEASES OF RESERVES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 90-364,
AND OTHER PROVISIONS

	Proposed budget authority	Proposed releases of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other provisions
THE JUDICIARY			
Customs Court: Salaries and expenses-----	\$124, 850	-----	-----
Courts of Appeals, District courts, and other judicial services:			
Salaries of judges-----	245, 000	-----	-----
Salaries of supporting personnel-----	2, 865, 000	-----	-----
Travel and miscellaneous expenses-----	525, 000	-----	-----
Administrative Office of the United States Courts-----	132, 500	-----	\$10, 000
Total-----	3, 892, 350	-----	10, 000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Council of Economic Advisers:			
Salaries and expenses-----	\$135, 000	-----	-----
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
Consumer and Marketing Service:			
Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs-----	\$3, 897, 000	\$400, 000	-----
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Sugar Act program-----	7, 500, 000	-----	-----
Forest Service: Forest protection and utilization-----	26, 256, 000	1, 676, 000	-----
Total-----	37, 653, 000	2, 076, 000	-----
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
Maritime Administration:			
State marine schools-----	-----	-----	\$210, 000

	Proposed budget authority	Proposed releases of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other provisions
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY			
Military personnel:			
Reserve personnel, Navy-----	\$8,500,000	-----	-----
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps-----	9,900,000	-----	-----
Retired pay, Defense-----	175,000,000	-----	-----
Operation and maintenance:			
Operation and maintenance,			
Navy-----	26,100,000	-----	\$17,000,000
Operation and maintenance,			
Marine Corps-----	4,600,000	-----	1,500,000
Operation and maintenance,			
Army National Guard-----	13,000,000	-----	-----
Operation and maintenance, Air			
National Guard-----	15,682,000	-----	-----
Total-----	252,782,000	-----	18,500,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE			
Office of Education: Higher edu-			
cational activities-----	\$11,161,000	\$160,000	-----
Public Health Service: Office of the			
Surgeon General: Comprehen-			
sive health planning and serv-			
ices-----	-----	9,478,000	\$250,000
Social and Rehabilitation Service:			
Grants to States for maintenance			
payments-----	373,524,000	-----	-----
Grants to States for medical			
assistance-----	278,022,000	-----	-----
Assistance for repatriated U.S.			
nationals-----	100,000	-----	-----
Assistance for refugees in the			
United States-----	2,853,000	38,000	-----
Total-----	665,660,000	9,676,000	250,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
Renewal and housing assistance:			
Low rent public housing annual			
contributions:			
1968-----	\$7,168,000	-----	-----
1969-----	16,000,000	-----	-----
College housing-----	-----	-----	\$4,500,000
Metropolitan development: Salaries			
and expenses-----	530,000	-----	-----
Mortgage credit: Home-ownership			
and rental housing assistance-----	-----	-----	100,000,000
Departmental management:			
Payment of participation sales			
insufficiencies-----	4,836,000	-----	-----
Fair housing program-----	2,000,000	-----	-----
Total:			
1968-----	7,168,000	-----	-----
1969-----	23,366,000	-----	104,500,000

	Proposed budget authority	Proposed releases of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other provisions
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
Bureau of Land Management:			
Management of lands and re- sources.....	\$10, 860, 000	-----	\$1, 628, 000
Bureau of Indian Affairs: Resources management.....	2, 619, 000	\$426, 000	-----
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation:			
Land and water conservation.....	-----	-----	39, 000, 000
Bureau of Mines: Helium fund.....	10, 000, 000	-----	-----
Office of Oil and Gas: Salaries and expenses.....	123, 000	-----	-----
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:			
Payment to fishermen's protec- tive fund.....	60, 000	-----	-----
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Management and in- vestigations of resources.....	1, 492, 000	-----	-----
National Park Service:			
Management and protection.....	2, 499, 000	175, 000	-----
Construction.....	100, 000	-----	-----
Total.....	<u>27, 753, 000</u>	<u>601, 000</u>	<u>40, 628, 000</u>

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general ad- ministration:			
Salaries and expenses, general administration.....	\$102, 000	\$233, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	1, 321, 000	200, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	71, 000	352, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses, U.S. attorneys and marshals.....	1, 497, 000	150, 000	-----
Federal Prison System:			
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons.....	2, 319, 000	250, 000	-----
Support of U.S. prisoners.....	2, 000, 000	-----	-----
Total.....	<u>7, 310, 000</u>	<u>1, 185, 000</u>	<u>-----</u>

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration; Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses.....	\$2, 143, 000	\$400, 000	-----
Bureau of Employment Security:			
Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-serv- icemen.....	36, 000, 000	-----	-----
Bureau of Employees' Compensa- tion: Employees' compensation claims and expenses.....	11, 100, 000	-----	-----
Total.....	<u>49, 243, 000</u>	<u>400, 000</u>	<u>-----</u>

	Proposed budget authority	Proposed releases of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other provisions
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Coast Guard: Retired pay-----	\$2,300,000	-----	-----
TREASURY DEPARTMENT			
Bureau of the Public Debt: Admin- istering the public debt-----	\$1,978,000	\$334,000	-----
VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
Compensation and pensions-----	\$179,000,000	-----	-----
Readjustment benefits-----	14,200,000	-----	-----
Medical care-----	46,189,000	\$15,167,000	-----
General operating expenses-----	12,500,000	-----	-----
Total-----	<u>251,889,000</u>	<u>15,167,000</u>	-----
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
Federal funds:			
Federal payment to the District of Columbia-----	\$11,000,000	-----	-----
Loans to the District of Colum- bia for capital outlay-----	18,736,000	-----	-----
District of Columbia funds:			
Operating expenses:			
General operating expenses...	-----	-----	\$1,070,000
Public safety-----	-----	-----	10,079,000
Education-----	-----	-----	13,931,000
Settlement of claims and suits...	-----	-----	26,000
Capital outlay-----	-----	-----	18,736,000
Total-----	<u>29,736,000</u>	<u>-----</u>	<u>43,842,000</u>
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION			
Salaries and expenses-----	\$650,000	-----	-----
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES			
Salaries and expenses-----	\$3,000,000	-----	-----
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION			
Salaries and expenses-----	-----	-----	\$300,000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM			
Salaries and expenses-----	<u>\$3,139,000</u>	<u>-----</u>	<u>-----</u>
Total:			
1968-----	\$7,168,000	-----	-----
1969-----	1,360,486,350	\$29,439,000	\$208,240,000

TITLE II

OTHER PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR VARIOUS PROGRAMS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1969

THE JUDICIARY

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$124,850.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", \$245,000.

SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

For an additional amount for "Salaries of supporting personnel", \$2,865,000.

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous expenses", \$525,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of the United States Courts", \$132,500, and, in addition, \$10,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Expenses of referees", fiscal year 1969.

As provided by statute, proposed supplemental appropriations for the Judiciary are submitted without change.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$135,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide funds to prepare and publish special studies of private and public activities bearing on price stability, and to hold conferences and work with business, labor, and public officials to promote overall price stability.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

CONSUMER PROTECTIVE, MARKETING, AND REGULATORY PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for "Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", \$3,897,000: *(and release of \$400,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$1,000,000 for a program of technical assistance to States to improve the quality of their poultry inspection programs under the Wholesome Poultry Products Act (Public Law 90-492); approved August 18, 1968. It would also provide \$2,897,000 of budget authority and \$400,000 of released reserves for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on September 28, 1968.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Sugar Act program", \$7,500,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide funds to make mandatory payments due on the 1968 sugar crop.

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For an additional amount for "Forest protection and utilization", as follows: "Forest land management", \$24,568,000; "Forest research", \$1,564,000; and "State and private forestry cooperation", \$124,000: *(and release of \$1,676,000 reserved under "Forest protection and utilization" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$19,324,000 in new budget authority and \$1,676,000 of released reserves for expenses of fighting forest fires. The request would also provide \$6,932,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on October 31, 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

For an additional amount for "State marine schools", for liquidation of obligations incurred for payment of allowances for uniforms, textbooks and subsistence of cadets at State marine schools, to remain available until expended, \$210,000, *to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Ship construction".*

This proposed provision is required to meet obligations incurred for the payment of allowances to cadets in State marine schools and is occasioned by higher than anticipated enrollment in fiscal years 1967, 1968, and 1969.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Reserve personnel, Navy", \$8,500,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$5,000,000 for per diem payments to reservists under Public Law 90-168 of December 1, 1967. Experience has shown that actual costs exceed the January 1968 estimates. The request would also provide \$3,500,000 for increased military pay costs under Public Law 90-207.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", \$9,900,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$300,000 for per diem payments to reservists, and \$8,000,000 to maintain the average strength required by Public Law 90-500 of September 20, 1968. In addition, the request would provide \$1,600,000 for increased military pay costs under Public Law 90-207.

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for "Retired pay, Defense", \$175,000,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$162,000,000 for increased mandatory payments, tied to increases in the consumer price index, to retired personnel. The request would also provide \$13,000,000 for increased retired pay costs under Public Law 90-207.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Navy", \$26,100,000: *Provided, That the amount made available under this appropriation for maintenance of real property only is hereby reduced from "\$155,600,000" to "\$138,600,000"*.

This proposal would allow \$17,000,000 now earmarked for maintenance of real property to be utilized for the general purposes of the appropriation. Also, \$26,100,000 is requested for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", \$4,600,000: *Provided, That the amount made available under this appropriation for maintenance of real property only is hereby reduced from "\$22,661,000" to "\$21,161,000"*.

This proposal would allow \$1,500,000 now earmarked for maintenance of real property to be utilized for the general purposes of the appropriation. In addition, the request includes \$2,650,000 for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206, and \$1,950,000 for wage-board pay increases.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", \$13,000,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$5,400,000 for personnel benefits for National Guard technicians converted to Federal employee status in January 1969 under Public Law 90-486 of August 13, 1968. The request would also provide \$4,650,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206, and \$2,950,000 for wage-board pay increases.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 16, 1968.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard", \$15,682,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$2,000,000 for personnel benefits to National Guard technicians converted to Federal employee status as of January 1969 under Public Law 90-486 of August 13, 1968, and \$7,000,000 for the costs of the earlier-than-anticipated release of Air National Guard units from active duty. The request would also provide \$2,682,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206, and \$4,000,000 for wage-board pay increases.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 16, 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher educational activities", including payments authorized by section 108(b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as amended (Public Law 90-354, approved June 20, 1968), and annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), \$11,161,000, of which \$3,920,000 shall remain available until expended for said annual interest grants: Provided, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from amounts reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364 under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$7,241,000 as a lump-sum payment in lieu of a land-grant for the Federal City College of the District of Columbia, as authorized by Public Law 90-354 of June 20, 1968. The money would be invested in bonds and the interest used for support of the College's operations in accordance with provisions of the First Morrill Act of 1862.

The request also includes \$3,920,000 for interest subsidy grants as authorized by the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (Public Law 90-575), approved October 16, 1968. This amount represents the first annual interest payment on loans from non-Federal sources estimated at \$145,000,000. These loans replace an equivalent amount of direct Federal loans.

In addition, a transfer of \$160,000 of released reserves is requested for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Comprehensive health planning and services", \$9,186,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364: (and release of \$292,000 reserved under "Comprehensive health planning and services" pursuant to said section 201): Provided, that the amount made available under "Comprehensive health planning and services" in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1969, for grants under section 314(a) of the Public Health Service Act is reduced from "\$7,375,000" to "\$7,125,000".

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide a transfer of \$9,186,000 from reserves released in other accounts and \$164,000 from reserves released in this account for measures to combat a major epidemic of German measles expected in 1970. The funds (together with an additional \$250,000 proposed to be made available through Congressional action to reduce funds earmarked for planning grants) are proposed for project grants to State and local health departments to aid them in initiating a program of intensive immunization of school and preschool children.

The amount proposed for release from reserves under this appropriation also includes \$128,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Laws 90-206 and 90-207.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MAINTENANCE PAYMENTS

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for maintenance payments", \$373,524,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide additional funds for grants to States for maintenance payments to dependent persons. The latest estimates available from States indicate that the amount already appropriated will fall short of meeting the statutory Federal share.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR MEDICAL ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for medical assistance", \$278,022,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide additional funds for grants to States for medical assistance payments. The latest estimates available from States indicate that the amount already appropriated for this purpose will fall short of meeting the statutory Federal share.

ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES NATIONALS

For an additional amount for "Assistance for repatriated United States nationals", \$100,000.

This proposal would provide \$100,000 for unanticipated costs of temporary assistance for destitute American citizens whose repatriation from Cuba has just recently been agreed to by the Cuban government.

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

For an additional amount for "Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$2,853,000, and, in addition, \$38,000 which shall be derived by transfer from amounts reserved under "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide (1) \$1,254,000 for unanticipated increases in welfare costs of refugees resettled outside the Miami, Florida area, (2) \$755,000 for increased per-pupil rates for Cuban children in the Dade County, Florida school system, and (3) \$844,000 for costs of transporting refugees from Cuba to the United States which were previously financed from an appropriation to the Department of State. An additional transfer of \$38,000 from released reserves is requested for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

COLLEGE HOUSING

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with educational institutions entered into pursuant to section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604), is increased by \$4,500,000.

This proposal will permit expansion of the program of annual debt service grants to colleges to cover an estimated \$300,000,000 of privately financed loans. Debt service grants reduce the cost of borrowing in the private market for constructing housing and related facilities for college students, faculty, student nurses, and interns to the rate which would have been applicable if direct Federal loans were provided instead.

The program of debt service grants was authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 and was provided with an authorization of \$3,000,000 in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1969.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For additional amounts for "Low rent public housing annual contributions", \$7,168,000 for the fiscal year 1968, and \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$7,168,000 for fiscal year 1968 and \$16,000,000 for fiscal year 1969 to meet contractual requirements for annual contributions for low rent public housing. Funds appropriated in these 2 years were not sufficient to meet the Government's commitments under contracts with local housing authorities.

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$530,000.

This proposal would provide \$250,000 for administrative costs of carrying out the new program of guarantees for financing new community land development contained in the "New Communities Act of 1968", Title IV of the Housing and Urban Development Act (Public Law 90-448), approved August 1, 1968. It would also provide \$280,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat. 477), is increased by \$50,000,000 and the limitation on total payments under those entered into under section 236 of such Act (82 Stat. 498) is increased by \$50,000,000

The Housing and Urban Development Act (Public Law 90-448), approved August 1, 1968, established the Homeownership and Rental Housing Assistance programs to assist lower income families to acquire homes, and to provide assistance to lower income families desiring rental dwellings. The Congress has approved a limit of \$25,000,000 on the total annual payments that may be required by contracts in each program, leaving a balance of \$50,000,000 in statutory authority available for appropriation action in each program. An increase in the limits by \$50,000,000 for each program is needed to accomplish the goals established by the Congress in the Act.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

For an additional amount for "Payment of participation sales insufficiencies", \$4,836,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation is for payments required by the Government National Mortgage Association, as trustee, to meet insufficiencies of interest on participation certificates sold for the

account of the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the authority of the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act, 1968. Amounts already appropriated, and other sums available to meet insufficiencies, will not be sufficient to cover the difference between the interest on the certificates and interest collections on the underlying loans.

FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Fair housing program", \$2,000,000.

This proposed appropriation would provide additional funds to carry out responsibilities assigned to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development by Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act (Public Law 90-284), approved April 11, 1968. These responsibilities include: (1) carrying out educational activities aimed at achieving voluntary compliance; (2) the investigation and conciliation of complaints; (3) making studies and issuing reports concerning the nature and extent of discriminatory housing practices; and (4) assisting and cooperating with Federal, State, local and private agencies and organizations which carry on programs to prevent or eliminate discriminatory housing practices.

The additional amount is needed to enable the Department to carry out effectively the requirements of Title VIII, which expanded significantly after December 31, 1968, to include coverage of a substantially increased number of dwelling units.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$10,860,000, and, in addition, \$1,628,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Water supply and water pollution control", fiscal year 1969.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$10,860,000 for the cost of emergency fire suppression and rehabilitation of burned-over lands during the 1968 fire season, and for similar anticipated expenses in the remainder of the current fiscal year. The request would also provide a transfer of \$1,628,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. These actions were reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on August 30, 1968 and October 26, 1968.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", \$2,619,000: (and release of \$426,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

This supplemental appropriation would provide \$1,000,000 for the suppression and emergency prevention of fires affecting forest range lands of Indian reservations, as well as the emergency rehabilitation

of burned-over areas to prevent further damage from weather conditions. In addition, \$1,238,000 is requested for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206, and \$381,000 of budget authority and \$426,000 of released reserves is requested for wage board pay increases.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on December 31, 1968.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For a repayable advance to the "Land and water conservation fund", as authorized by section 4(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-7), for liquidation of obligations incurred against such fund pursuant to law, \$39,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For an additional amount for "Land and water conservation", to be derived from the "Land and water conservation fund" and to remain available until expended for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to section 3(b)(1) of the Act of October 2, 1968 (Public Law 90-545), \$39,000,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$39,000,000 to liquidate obligations incurred as a result of the legislative taking of right, title, and interest in certain real property within the boundaries of the Redwood National Park, California, by Public Law 90-545 of October 2, 1968.

BUREAU OF MINES

HELIUM FUND

For an additional amount of borrowing authority for the "Helium fund", \$10,000,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$10,000,000 to finance purchases of helium already contracted for by the Fund. The additional borrowing authority is necessary to offset a decline in revenues from helium sales and services.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$123,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$75,000 for facility surveillance and inspection programs to assure compliance with oil import regulations, and \$48,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

PAYMENT TO FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND

For payment to "Fishermen's Protective Fund", established pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1968 (82 Stat. 729), \$60,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$60,000 to implement, within the 180 days specified by the statute, the Fishermen's Protective Act (Public Law 90-482), approved August 12, 1968. This law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements to indemnify the owners and crews of American fishing vessels seized or detained by a foreign country under certain conditions.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", \$1,492,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$250,000 to initiate a study of estuarine resources required by Public Law 90-454 of August 3, 1968, and \$1,242,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", \$2,499,000: (and release of \$175,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$800,000 for actual and anticipated costs of emergency fire suppression and rehabilitation in national parks. An additional \$1,477,000 of budget authority and \$175,000 of released reserves are requested for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206, and \$222,000 is requested for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-320.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$100,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide funds for the Washington Channel Parking Study required by Public Law 90-483 of August 13, 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general administration", \$102,000, and, in addition, \$231,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, and \$2,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service", pursuant to said section 201.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$102,000 for continuation of a data processing project within the Customs Section of the Civil Division. The operation is expected to double annual case disposition. The request also includes \$233,000 of reserves released and transferred from other accounts for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206, and for wage-board pay increases.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", \$1,321,000, and, in addition, \$100,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364: (and release of \$100,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities" pursuant to said section 201).

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$275,000 for enforcement of the fair housing and criminal penalties provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, and \$206,000 for increases in attorney salaries, effective September 1, 1968, resulting from the promulgation of revised standards of attorney positions by the Civil Service Commission. In addition, the request includes \$840,000 of budget authority, \$100,000 of reserves released and transferred from another account, and \$100,000 of reserves released from this account for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", \$71,000, and, in addition, \$262,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364: (and release of \$90,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division" pursuant to said section 201).

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$71,000 for increases in attorney salaries, effective September 1, 1968, resulting from the promulgation of revised standards of attorney positions by

the Civil Service Commission. The request also includes \$262,000 of released reserves transferred from another account and \$90,000 of released reserves from this account for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", \$1,497,000: *(and release of \$150,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$52,000 for increases in attorney salaries, effective September 1, 1968, resulting from the promulgation of revised standards for attorney positions by the Civil Service Commission. The request also includes \$1,445,000 of budget authority and \$150,000 of released reserves for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", \$2,319,000: *(and release of \$250,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$477,000 for the expenses of keeping a larger than anticipated number of prisoners confined in Federal institutions. The request also includes \$1,734,000 for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206, \$35,000 of budget authority and \$250,000 of released reserves for wage board pay increases, and \$73,000 for increased military pay costs under Public Law 90-207.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on September 30, 1968.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States Prisoners", \$2,000,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$2,000,000 for the added expenses of keeping a greater than anticipated number of Federal prisoners confined in non-Federal institutions.

Jail days for 1969 are now estimated at 1,400,000, an increase of 400,000 over the original 1969 estimate.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on September 30, 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR, SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses", *including carrying out labor mobility demonstration program and trainee placement assistance demonstration projects, as authorized by the Act of October 24, 1968 (Public Law 90-636)*, \$2,143,000, to remain available until June 10, 1970: *(and release of \$400,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$2,000,000 for a program of grants or loans to defray the relocation costs of unemployed persons with offers of employment elsewhere, and \$143,000 in budget authority and \$87,000 of released reserves for indemnification of losses suffered by employers through certain illegal actions of employees who have completed federally sponsored training programs. The request would also provide a release from reserves of \$313,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$36,000,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide funds to cover increases in mandatory payments due to a larger than expected number of claimants and an increase in the size of the average payment. Of the total request, \$16,947,000 is for reimbursement of funds advanced in fiscal year 1968 and \$19,053,000 is to cover the increased costs now expected for fiscal year 1969.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on December 5, 1968.

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION
EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION CLAIMS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses", \$11,100,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$5,743,000 for reimbursement of advances made in fiscal year 1968, and \$5,357,000 to meet increased benefit payments due to increases in medical costs and the consumer price index.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on December 5, 1968.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$2,300,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$2,300,000 to make larger mandatory payments to retired Coast Guard personnel. The amount of retired pay, according to statute, increases as the consumer price index rises.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$1,978,000: *(and release of \$334,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$572,000 for increased payments to banks and other paying agents who redeem savings-type securities on behalf of the Federal Government, and \$863,000 for increased reimbursable operating costs of Federal Reserve banks acting as fiscal agents for the Bureau of the Public Debt. It also includes a request for \$543,000 in budget authority and \$334,000 in release of reserves for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$179,000,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide (1) \$110,700,000 for increased rates of compensation to disabled veterans under Public Law 90-493 of August 19, 1968; (2) \$59,264,000 for an increase in the income limitation and for increased pension rates under Public Law 90-275 of March 28, 1968; (3) \$6,236,000 for peacetime and Vietnam veterans becoming eligible for benefits in numbers greater than originally estimated and at a higher average cost; and (4) \$2,800,000 to implement the part-time vocational rehabilitation training authorized by Public Law 90-431 of July 26, 1968.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 19, 1968.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", \$14,200,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$14,200,000 to meet the costs of expanded and liberalized educational benefits under Public Law 90-631 of October 23, 1968.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 19, 1968.

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$46,189,000: *(and release of \$15,167,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$14,794,000 to meet increased costs due to unanticipated workload increases, and the increase of travel, postal, and *per diem* rates pursuant to administrative action and Public Laws 90-429 and 90-432 of July 26, 1968. It would also provide \$31,395,000 of budget authority and \$8,167,000 from released reserves for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206, and \$7,000,000 from released reserves for wage-board pay increases.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 19, 1968.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$12,500,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$4,600,000 for the costs of administering five recent laws affecting Veterans Administration programs and \$7,900,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 19, 1968.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia", for the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$11,000,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation represents the authorized but unappropriated portion of the Federal payment to the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1969. The current Federal payment authorized by Public Law 90-450 of August 2, 1968, is \$90,000,000, of which \$79,000,000 was appropriated in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1969.

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay", for the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$18,736,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation will permit the District of Columbia to pay the balance of its matching share of 1969 construction costs of the rail rapid transit system.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$1,070,000, of which \$1,000 shall be payable from the highway fund.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$130,000 for subsidy payments to transit companies for the transportation of school children, and \$940,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", \$10,079,000, of which \$528,000 shall be payable from the highway fund.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$2,065,000 for increased costs of the police, courts and other public safety agencies caused by the October 1968 disturbances; police overtime during the

1968 Christmas season; and Public Law 90-579 of October 17, 1968, which increased salaries and made other changes in the local court system. The request also includes \$1,266,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206, and \$6,748,000 for increased pay and related costs for police and firemen under Public Law 90-320.

EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Education", \$13,931,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$846,000 to meet part of the costs of financing food service workers' salaries from general revenues of the District of Columbia, as now required by Public Law 90-640 of October 25, 1968, rather than from charges for school lunches. In addition, the request would provide \$285,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206, and \$12,800,000 for increased pay and related costs for teachers under Public Law 90-319.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For payment of claims in excess of \$250, approved by the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$26,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide for the payment of claims settled by the Corporation Counsel and approved by the Commissioner or the former Board of Commissioners.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", \$18,736,000, of which \$1,514,000 shall not be available for expenditure until July 1, 1969.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would, when added to the \$3,150,000 already appropriated, permit the District of Columbia to meet its share of capital outlay costs for the rail rapid transit system.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated herein for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$650,000.

This proposal would provide \$150,000 to carry out the Commission's responsibilities under a joint Federal Trade Commission-Food and Drug Administration program to evaluate the advertising of certain drugs, and \$500,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, not to exceed a total of \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide up to \$3,000,000 of Federal funds to match private gifts made to the Foundation.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The appropriation granted under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1969, shall be available for the purchase of one aircraft for replacement only.

The proposed appropriation language would permit the National Center for Atmospheric Research to replace a crashed research aircraft necessary if the Center is to meet its urgent research support needs. The request would allow the use of funds already available for other purposes.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$3,139,000.

This proposal would provide \$1,000,000 for processing an increased number of inductees required by the Department of Defense. It would also provide \$2,139,000 for increased military and civilian pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206 and Public Law 90-207.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation for increased pay costs. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on January 16, 1969.

TITLE III

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1969, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate:

- "Salaries, officers and employees", \$1,851,545;
- "Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", \$16,895;
- Contingent expenses of the Senate:
 - "Senate policy committees", \$24,210;
 - "Automobiles and maintenance", \$2,180;
 - "Inquiries and investigations", \$343,370; *including \$11,980 for the Committee on Appropriations*;
 - "Folding documents", \$2,565;
 - "Miscellaneous items", \$186,515, *including \$118,000 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961*;

House of Representatives:

- "Office of the Speaker", \$4,015;
- "Office of the Parliamentarian", \$3,985;
- "Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives", \$670;
- "Office of the Chaplain", \$1,250;
- "Office of the Clerk", \$110,000;
- "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$192,000;
- "Office of the Doorkeeper", \$115,000;
- "Office of the Postmaster", \$37,875;
- "Committee employees", \$500,000;

Special and minority employees:

- "Minority employees", \$11,410;
- "House Democratic steering committee", \$1,090;
- "House Republican conference", \$1,090;
- "Majority leader", \$4,800;
- "Minority leader", \$4,005;
- "Majority whip", \$3,885;
- "Minority whip", \$3,885;
- "Printing clerks", \$980;
- "Technical assistant in the office of the attending physician", \$1,065;
- "Official reporters of debates", \$27,000;
- "Official reporters to committees", \$24,760;
- "Office of the legislative counsel", \$45,600;
- "Members' clerk hire", \$2,900,000;
- Contingent expenses of the House:
 - "Special and select committees", \$129,000;
 - "Revision of laws", \$740;
 - "Speaker's automobile", \$665;
 - "Majority leader's automobile", \$665;
 - "Minority leader's automobile", \$665;

Joint items:

- "Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures", \$3,100, to remain available until expended;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

- "Joint Economic Committee", \$21,030;
- "Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", \$16,825;
- "Joint Committee on Printing", \$11,430;

Contingent expenses of the House:
 "Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation", \$23,000;
 "Joint Committee on Defense Production", \$7,950;
 Architect of the Capitol:
 Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", \$36,000;
 Capitol buildings and grounds:
 "Capitol buildings", \$74,500;
 "Capitol grounds", \$25,600;
 "Senate office buildings", \$174,000;
 "Senate garage", \$6,500;
 "House office buildings", \$320,000;
 "Capitol power plant", \$27,500;
 Library buildings and grounds: "Structural and mechanical care", \$28,000;
 Botanic Garden: "Salaries and expenses", \$12,500;
 Library of Congress:
 "Salaries and expenses", \$747,000;
 Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", \$122,000;
 Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$212,000;
 Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000;
 Books for the blind and physically handicapped: "Salaries and expenses", \$23,000;
 Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents:
 "Salaries and expenses", \$6,000;
 "Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)", \$11,000;
 Government Printing Office: Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and expenses", \$228,000;
 General Accounting Office: "Salaries and expenses", \$2,714,000;

THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States:
 "Salaries", \$80,000;
 "Care of the buildings and grounds", \$15,900;
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals: "Salaries and expenses", \$16,000;
 Court of Claims: "Salaries and expenses", \$34,000;
 Courts of Appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:
 "Expenses of referees", \$248,000;

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Bureau of the Budget: "Salaries and expenses", \$178,000; (*and release of \$355,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);
 Office of Emergency Preparedness:
 "Salaries and expenses", \$100,000; (*and release of \$70,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);
 "Salaries and expenses, Telecommunications"; (*Release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);
 "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies", \$30,000; (*and release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);
 Office of Science and Technology: "Salaries and expenses", (*Release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);
 Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: "Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Economic assistance:

"Administrative expenses", Agency for International Development, \$2,137,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1969;

"Administrative and other expenses", Department of State, \$95,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1969;

Peace Corps: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,100,000;

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service: "Salaries and expenses"; (*Release of \$6,615,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Cooperative State Research Service: "Payments and expenses", \$81,000, to be derived by transfer from "Penalty mail costs", fiscal year 1969;

Federal Extension Service: "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses"; (*Release of \$135,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Farmer Cooperative Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$73,000;

Soil Conservation Service:

"Conservation operations", \$3,980,000; (*and release of \$1,000,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

"Watershed planning", \$254,000; (*and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

"River basin surveys and investigations", \$306,000; (*and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

"Watershed works of improvement", \$688,000; (*and release of \$300,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

"Flood prevention", \$224,000; (*and release of \$128,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

"Great plains conservation program", \$160,000;

"Resource conservation and development", \$111,000; (*and release of \$100,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Economic Research Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$684,000;

Statistical Reporting Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$527,000;

Consumer and Marketing Service:

"Special milk program"; (*Release of \$15,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Foreign Agricultural Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$362,000, to be derived by transfer from "Cropland adjustment program", Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, fiscal year 1969; (*and release of \$68,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Foreign Agricultural Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Commodity Exchange Authority: "Salaries and expenses", \$65,000;

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: "Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service", \$4,508,000 of which \$2,226,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Cropland adjustment program", fiscal year 1969, \$1,560,000, from "Cropland conversion program", and \$722,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation Fund; (*and release of \$251,000 reserved under "Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Rural Community Development Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$18,000; (*and release of \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Office of the Inspector General: "Salaries and expenses", \$568,000;
 Packers and Stockyards Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$49,000; *(and release of \$64,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Office of the General Counsel: "Salaries and expenses", \$239,000;
 Office of Information: "Salaries and expenses", \$58,000;
 National Agricultural Library: "Salaries and expenses", \$40,000; *(and release of \$35,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Office of Management Services: "Salaries and expenses", \$116,000; *(and release of \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$188,000; *(and release of \$30,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Rural Electrification Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$624,000; *(and release of \$11,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Farmers Home Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$2,300,000;
 Federal Crop Insurance Corporation: "Administrative and operating expenses", \$274,000; *(and release of \$97,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$245,000;
 Office of Business Economics: "Salaries and expenses", \$75,000; *(and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Bureau of the Census:
 "Salaries and expenses", \$567,000;
 "1967 economic censuses", \$285,000;
 Economic Development Administration: "Operations and administration", \$650,000; *(and release of \$116,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Business and Defense Services Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$206,000; *(and release of \$36,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 International Activities:
 "Salaries and expenses", \$200,000; *(and release of \$163,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 "Export control", \$136,000; *(and release of \$60,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Office of Field Services: "Salaries and expenses", \$142,000; *(and release of \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Environmental Science Services Administration:
 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,489,000; *(and release of \$656,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 "Research and development", \$614,000 *(and release of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Patent Office: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,240,000; *(and release of \$321,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 National Bureau of Standards: "Research and technical services", \$1,100,000;
 Maritime Administration:
 "Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses, \$261,000;
 "Maritime training", \$199,000;
 Foreign Direct Investment Control: "Salaries and expenses", \$173,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Military personnel:

- "Military personnel, Army", \$331,000,000;
- "Military personnel, Navy", \$198,700,000;
- "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$64,500,000;
- "Military personnel, Air Force", \$267,600,000;
- "Reserve personnel, Army", \$5,600,000;
- "Reserve personnel, Air Force", \$1,900,000;
- "National Guard personnel, Army", \$16,400,000;
- "National Guard personnel, Air Force", \$3,400,000;

Operation and Maintenance:

- "Operation and maintenance, Army", \$106,800,000;
- "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$91,200,000;
- "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", \$40,500,000;
- "Court of Military Appeals", \$18,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army:

Corps of Engineers—Civil:

- "Operation and maintenance, general", \$1,731,000, *and in addition, \$1,869,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Construction general", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;*
- "General expenses", \$1,131,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Construction, general", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*

United States Soldiers' Home: "Operation and maintenance"; *(Release of \$181,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

The Panama Canal:

Canal Zone Government: "Operating expenses", \$1,085,000 *(and release of \$120,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

Panama Canal Company Fund: "Limitation on general and administrative expenses", *(Increase of \$171,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and release of \$20,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Food and Drug Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,589,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$835,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Food and Drug Administration pursuant to said section 201);*

Office of Education:

"School assistance in federally affected areas", \$16,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$12,000 reserved under "School assistance in federally affected areas" pursuant to said section 201);*

"Salaries and expenses", \$694,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$1,123,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to said section 201);*

"Civil rights educational activities", \$67,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;*

Public Health Service:

Office of the Surgeon General:

"Salaries and expenses", \$307,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$80,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to said section 201);*

Health Manpower: "Health manpower education and utilization"; (Release of \$303,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Disease prevention and environmental control:

"Chronic diseases", \$436,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$130,000 reserved under "Chronic diseases" pursuant to said section 201);*

"Air pollution"; (Release of \$553,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Urban and industrial health"; (Release of \$492,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Radiological health", \$407,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;*

Health Services:

"Community health services"; (Release of \$640,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Patient care and special health services", \$2,246,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$91,000 reserved under "Patient care and special health services" pursuant to said section 201);*

"Hospital construction activities"; (Release of \$175,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Indian health activities", \$2,640,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$214,000 reserved under "Indian health activities" pursuant to said section 201);*

"Emergency health activities"; (Release of \$202,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

National Institutes of Health:

"Biologics standards"; (Release of \$114,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Regional medical programs"; (Release of \$67,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Environmental health sciences"; (Release of \$137,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

National Institute of Mental Health:

"Mental health research and services", \$401,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$801,000 reserved under "Mental health research and services" pursuant to said section 201);*

"Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Salaries and expenses", \$1,984,000 *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;*

Other Public Health Service:

"National health statistics"; (*Release of \$271,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

"National Library of Medicine"; (*Release of \$162,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Social and Rehabilitation Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,234,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*;

Social Security Administration: "Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)", (*Increase of \$18,147,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and expenses"*);

Special Institutions:

"Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", \$56,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*;

"Howard University, salaries and expenses", \$401,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*;

"Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses", \$291,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*;

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", \$216,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364: (and release of \$232,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to said section 201)*;

"Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses", \$215,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*;

"Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses"; (*Release of \$458,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

"Office of Administration, salaries and expenses", \$233,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364: (and release of \$10,000 reserved under "Office of Administration, salaries and expenses" pursuant to said section 201)*;

"Surplus property utilization", \$57,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*;

"Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses", \$56,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364: (and release of \$61,000 reserved under "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses" pursuant to said section 201)*;

"Educational broadcasting facilities", (*Release of \$18,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Renewal and Housing Assistance: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,407,000; (*and release of \$387,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Metropolitan Development: "Salaries and expenses"; (*Release of \$73,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations:

"Salaries and expenses", \$66,000; and, in addition, \$171,000 (including \$34,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) to be derived by transfer from "Model cities program; (and release of \$15,000 reserved on account of "Salaries and expenses", Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Urban Research and Technology", (Release of \$6,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Departmental Management:

"General administration", \$230,000; (and release of \$51,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Regional management and services", \$278,000; (and release of \$80,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Mortgage Credit:

"Limitation on administrative and non-administrative expenses, Federal housing administration", (Increase of \$465,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and increase of \$3,770,000 in the limitation on non-administrative expenses);

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Indian Affairs:

"Education and welfare services", \$2,843,000; (and release of \$415,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Construction", (Release of \$39,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)", (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"General administrative expenses", \$246,000, to be derived by transfer from "Water supply and water pollution control", fiscal year 1969;

"Operation and maintenance, Indian irrigation systems"; (Release of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Power systems, Indian irrigation projects"; (Release of \$39,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, schools, etc."; (Release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Tribal funds"; (Release of \$48,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation: "Salaries and expenses", \$175,000; Geological Survey: "Surveys, investigations, and research", \$1,792,000;

Bureau of Mines:

"Conservation and development of mineral resources", \$1,183,000, to be derived by transfer from "Solid waste disposal";

"Health and safety", \$347,000, to be derived by transfer from "Solid waste disposal";

"General administrative expenses", \$70,000, to be derived by transfer from "Solid waste disposal";

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

- "Management and investigations of resources", \$660,000;
(and release of \$27,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development", \$8,000;
- "Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation", \$7,000;
- "General administrative expenses", \$45,000;
- "Administration of Pribilof Islands", \$20,000;
- "Promote and develop fishery products and research pertaining to American fisheries"; (Release of \$10,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund",
(Increase of \$13,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:

- "General administrative expenses", \$82,000;
- "Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation", \$9,000;

National Park Service:

- "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities",
\$683,000; (and release of \$100,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "General administrative expenses", \$186,000;
- "Preservation of historic properties", \$21,000;

Bureau of Reclamation:

- "General investigations", \$371,000;
- "Operation and maintenance", \$787,000;
- "General administrative expenses", \$503,000;

Bonneville Power Administration:

- "Construction"; (Release of \$998,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "Operation and maintenance"; (Release of \$643,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "Construction of electric transmission lines and substations, contributions, Bonneville Power Project"; (Release of \$1,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", \$298,000;

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", \$408,000;

Office of Water Resources Research: "Salaries and expenses", \$31,000;

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration: "Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service"; (Release of \$88,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Federal Bureau of Investigation: "Salaries and expenses", \$9,220,000;

Immigration and Naturalization Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$3,261,000; (and release of \$270,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration: "Salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$57,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs: "Salaries and expenses", \$450,000; (and release of \$400,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration:

"Manpower development and training activities, salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$92,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses", \$363,000, of which \$213,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Wage and Hour Division, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, \$142,000 by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Bureau of Employment Security, pursuant to said section 201, and \$8,000, by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Manpower development and training activities, pursuant to said section 201; (and release of \$50,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training pursuant to said section 201);

"Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses", (Increase of \$865,000 in the amount available for administrative expenses and release of \$125,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Labor-Management Relations: "Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses", (Release of \$448,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Wage and Labor Standards:

Wage and Labor Standards Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$152,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Wage and Hour Division, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, and \$52,000 by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Labor-Management Services Administration, pursuant to section 201; (and release of \$120,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Wage and Labor Standards Administration, pursuant to said section 201);

"Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$992,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Salaries and expenses", \$180,000; (and release of \$700,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Bureau of International Labor Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", \$14,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses, Wage and Hour Division" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$60,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Bureau of International Labor Affairs, pursuant to said section 201);

Office of the Solicitor: "Salaries and expenses", \$21,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses, Wage and Hour Division" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$200,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Office of the Solicitor, pursuant to said section 201);

Office of the Secretary:

"Salaries and expenses", \$121,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses, Wage and Hour Division" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$110,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Office of the Secretary, pursuant to said section 201);*

Office of Federal Contract Compliance and Civil Rights Program:

"Salaries and expenses", \$39,000, *to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses, Wage and Hour Division" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$3,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Office of Federal Contract Compliance and Civil Rights Program pursuant to said section 201);*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(OUT OF POSTAL FUND)

"Administration and regional operations"; \$3,304,000; *(and release of \$2,107,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

"Research, development, and engineering", \$500,000;

"Operations", \$191,300,000, *and, in addition, \$54,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under the appropriation "Transportation," pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;*

"Supplies and services", \$467,000;

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", \$5,982,000, *and, in addition, \$750,000 to be derived by transfer from "Chamizal settlement", International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and \$83,000 from "Rama Road, Nicaragua";*

International Organizations and Conferences: "Missions to international organizations", \$118,000.

International Commissions:

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:

"Salaries and expenses", \$43,000;

"Operation and maintenance", \$29,000;

"American sections, international commissions", \$19,000;

Educational Exchange: "Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities", \$425,000;

"Migration and refugee assistance", \$26,000;

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", \$445,000;

Coast Guard:

"Operating expenses", \$10,000,000; *(and release of \$82,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

"Acquisition, construction and improvements"; *(Release of \$51,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

"Reserve training", \$1,000,000; (and release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Federal Aviation Administration:

"Operations", \$30,800,000;

"Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports", \$254,000;

Federal Highway Administration:

"Highway beautification", \$64,000;

"Traffic and highway safety"; (Release of \$210,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Motor carrier safety", \$68,000; (and release of \$22,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Highway Trust Fund:

"Limitation on general expenses", (Increase of \$1,875,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses; and release of \$641,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Federal Railroad Administration:

"Salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$35,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Bureau of railroad safety", \$140,000; (and release of \$39,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Urban Mass Transportation Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$31,000;

National Transportation Safety Board: "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000; (and release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", \$182,000; (and release of \$134,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Bureau of Accounts: "Salaries and expenses", \$390,000;

Bureau of Customs: "Salaries and expenses", \$2,637,000; (and release of \$1,550,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Bureau of the Mint: "Salaries and expenses", \$630,000;

Internal Revenue Service:

"Salaries and expenses", \$764,000; (and release of \$250,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Revenue accounting and processing", \$5,592,000;

"Compliance", \$6,810,000; (and release of \$16,850,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Office of the Treasurer: "Salaries and expenses", \$167,000; (and release of \$85,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

United States Secret Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,338,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", \$3,671,000; (and release of \$677,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service", \$1,358,000;

- "Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", \$500,000; (and release of \$95,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service"; (Release of \$5,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service"; (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", \$106,000;
- "Administrative operations fund"; (Release of \$107,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

- "Medical and prosthetic research", \$1,168,000; (and release of \$362,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- "Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses", \$589,000;

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

- American Battle Monuments Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$33,000;
- Arms Control and Disarmament Agency: "Arms control and disarmament activities", (Release of \$15,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- Civil Aeronautics Board: "Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;
- Civil Service Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,392,000; (and release of \$36,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$370,000;
- Export-Import Bank of the United States: "Limitation on administrative expenses", (Release of \$172,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- Farm Credit Administration: "Limitation on administrative expenses", (Increase of \$107,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);
- Federal Communications Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$927,000; (and release of \$16,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- Federal Home Loan Bank Board: "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses", (Increase of \$115,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and release of \$102,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- Federal Maritime Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$108,000; (and release of \$76,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$125,000; (and release of \$8,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
- Federal Power Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$778,000;
- Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$32,000;

Interstate Commerce Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$818,000; *(and release of \$382,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 National Capital Planning Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$30,000; *(and release of \$20,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 National Commission on Product Safety: "Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;
 National Labor Relations Board: "Salaries and expenses", \$601,000; *(and release of \$848,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Railroad Retirement Board: "Limitation on salaries and expenses", *(Increase of \$516,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses)*;
 Renegotiation Board: "Salaries and expenses", \$140,000;
 Securities and Exchange Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$670,000; *(and release of \$199,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Small Business Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$418,000; *(and release of \$265,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Smithsonian Institution:
 "Salaries and expenses", \$695,000; *(and release of \$125,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", \$59,000; *(and release of \$23,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Tariff Commission: "Salaries and expenses", *(Release of \$42,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 Tax Court of the United States: "Salaries and expenses", \$3,000; *(and release of \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364)*;
 United States Information Agency: "Salaries and expenses", \$4,367,000;

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

"Parks and recreation", \$392,000;
 "Health and welfare", \$2,437,000;
 "Highways and traffic", \$203,000, *of which \$180,000 shall be payable from the highway fund*;
 "Sanitary engineering", \$227,000, *of which \$99,000 shall be payable from the water fund, \$64,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and \$1,000 from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund*;
 "Personal services, wage-board employees", \$3,179,000, *of which \$153,000 shall be payable from the highway fund, \$184,000 from the water fund, \$169,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and \$2,000 from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund*.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. ——. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1969, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

Sec. ——. (a) Any appropriation for the fiscal year 1970 required to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, may be apportioned on a basis indicating the need (to the extent any such increases cannot be absorbed within available appropriations) for a supplemental or deficiency estimate of appropriation to the extent necessary to permit payment of such pay increases as may be granted to civilian officers and employees under the provisions of sections 212 and 225 of Public Law 90-206, and to military personnel under the provisions of section 8 of Public Law 90-207. Each such apportionment shall otherwise be subject to the requirements of section 3679, Revised Statutes, as amended.

(b) The amounts of all temporary appropriations hereafter made for continuing projects or activities in the fiscal year 1970 in advance of final enactment of appropriations therefor, are authorized to be increased to the extent necessary to permit payment of salaries at rates authorized pursuant to sections 212 and 225 of Public Law 90-206 and section 8 of Public Law 90-207.

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS

Organizational unit	Increase in pay and other related costs		Unabsorbed amount for payment to other appropriations
	Direct pay	Related costs	
Legislative branch:			
Public Law 90-206.....	\$10,553,198	\$270,496	}
Administrative action.....	83,004	3,917	
Wage board.....	782,200	46,300	
The judiciary:			
Public Law 90-206.....	2,168,363	148,372	}
Administrative action.....	345,000	23,000	
Wage board.....	21,000	1,400	
Executive Office of the President:			
The White House Office:			
Public Law 90-206.....	83,950	6,200	}
Administrative action.....	20,610	1,520	
Executive mansion and grounds:			
Public Law 90-206.....	21,800	1,300	}
Wage board.....	10,000	600	
Bureau of the Budget:			
Public Law 90-206.....	497,000	36,000	
Council of Economic Advisers:			
Public Law 90-206.....	7,600	532	}
Administrative action.....	24,497	1,716	
National Aeronautics and Space Council:			
Public Law 90-206.....	17,547	1,316	
National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development and Commission on Marine Sciences, Engineering, and Resources:			
Public Law 90-206.....	24,200	1,800	
National Security Council:			
Public Law 90-206.....	20,220	1,618	
Office of Emergency Preparedness:			
Public Law 90-206.....	398,000	30,000	}
Wage board.....	1,914	165	
Office of Science and Technology:			
Public Law 90-206.....	41,107	3,288	
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations:			
Public Law 90-206.....	26,187	1,833	
Funds appropriated to the President:			
Appalachian regional development programs:			
Public Law 90-206.....	78,224	6,132	
Disaster relief:			
Public Law 90-206.....	36,000	3,000	
Expansion of defense production:			
Public Law 90-206.....	22,000	2,000	
Military assistance:			
Public Law 90-206.....	645,000	53,000	
Economic assistance:			
Public Law 90-206.....	7,960,779	558,519	}
Administrative action.....	141,600	9,900	
Office of Economic Opportunity:			
Public Law 90-206.....	3,211,000	243,000	
Peace Corps:			
Public Law 90-206.....	814,000	55,000	231,000

FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1969

Absorption possible through—				Additional funds required	
Administrative action	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other congressional action	Total	Requested in Title II of this document	Recommended in this Title
\$184,800			\$184,800		\$11,554,315
7,835		\$10,000	17,835	\$2,305,400	393,900
112,280			112,280		
33,700			33,700		
	\$355,000		\$355,000		178,000
34,345			34,345		
18,863			18,863		
26,000			26,000		
21,838			21,838		
150,079	150,000		300,079		130,000
16,395	28,000		44,395		
3,020			3,020		25,000
84,356			84,356		
39,000			39,000		
24,000			24,000		
698,000			698,000		
6,572,798		2,232,000	8,804,798		
3,454,000			3,454,000		
					1,100,000

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR

Organizational unit	Increase in pay and other related costs		Unabsorbed amount for payment to other appropriations
	Direct pay	Related costs	
Department of Agriculture:			
Public Law 90-206.....	41,662,658	3,209,090	131,070
Administrative action.....	34,200	2,300	
Wage board.....	428,260	27,340	
Department of Commerce:			
Public Law 90-206.....	14,301,266	1,094,179	95,849
Public Law 90-207.....	128,600	4,400	
Administrative action.....	199,343	17,102	
Wage board.....	606,160	45,098	
Department of Defense—Military:			
Public Law 90-206.....	256,181,000	20,061,000	30,967,000
Public Law 90-207.....	849,122,000	71,695,000	
Administrative action.....	7,737,000	450,000	
Wage board.....	121,880,000	7,343,000	
Department of Defense—Civil:			
Public Law 90-206.....	11,306,916	891,970	2,974
Public Law 90-207.....	270,000	22,000	
Public Law 90-319.....	1,167,000	75,000	
Public Law 90-320.....	454,000	29,000	
Administrative action.....	17,993	1,295	
Wage board.....	3,413,153	276,987	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:			
Public Law 90-206.....	37,256,734	2,835,088	2,496,840
Public Law 90-207.....	4,000,400	55,700	
Administrative action.....	175,900	11,100	
Wage board.....	1,659,600	66,600	
Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
Public Law 90-206.....	7,725,037	617,723	75,400
Wage board.....	23,100	1,800	
Department of the Interior:			
Public Law 90-206.....	25,279,339	2,062,362	7,600
Public Law 90-320.....	203,130	18,870	
Administrative action.....	138,000	8,000	
Wage board.....	5,688,055	529,046	
Department of Justice:			
Public Law 90-206.....	17,196,241	1,216,186	
Public Law 90-207.....	73,000		
Administrative action.....	588,700	47,100	
Wage board.....	328,262	22,053	
Department of Labor:			
Public Law 90-206.....	4,734,620	707,130	
Post Office Department:			
Public Law 90-206.....	251,590,800	28,087,200	
Department of State:			
Public Law 90-206.....	9,470,299	672,885	158,021
Administrative action.....	179,069	14,140	
Wage board.....	73,305	5,838	
Department of Transportation:			
Public Law 90-206.....	36,316,071	2,564,659	
Public Law 90-207.....	10,186,400	824,600	
Administrative action.....	22,982	1,838	
Wage board.....	1,567,882	134,872	
Treasury Department:			
Public Law 90-206.....	36,624,990	2,458,294	83,000
Public Law 90-320.....	231,000	16,000	
Administrative action.....	650,000	52,000	
Wage board.....	1,548,255	103,314	

THE FISCAL YEAR 1969—Continued

Absorption possible through—				Additional funds required	
Administrative action	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other congressional action	Total	Requested in Title II of this document	Recommended in this Title
9,721,918	9,447,000	4,951,000	24,119,918	9,829,000	11,546,000
5,253,997	1,605,000	51,000	6,909,997	-----	9,582,000
174,736,000	-----	-----	174,736,000	63,082,000	1,127,618,000
11,620,288	3,321,000	171,000	15,112,288	-----	2,816,000
9,357,962	21,053,000	18,147,000	48,557,962	-----	-----
1,139,060	646,000	4,397,000	6,182,060	280,000	1,981,000
13,558,402	3,116,000	3,723,000	20,397,402	4,608,000	8,929,000
413,542	2,000,000	-----	2,413,542	4,127,000	12,931,000
432,750	3,923,000	906,000	5,261,750	-----	180,000
28,000,000	56,107,000	-----	84,107,000	-----	195,571,000
3,098,557	-----	833,000	3,931,557	-----	6,642,000
5,644,304	1,148,000	1,875,000	8,667,304	-----	42,952,000
3,510,853	19,203,000	-----	22,713,853	543,000	18,510,000

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR

Organizational unit	Increase in pay and other related costs		Unabsorbed amount for payment to other appropriations
	Direct pay	Related costs	
Atomic Energy Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	5,491,324	376,673	131,268
Wage board.....	4,888		
General Services Administration:			
Public Law 90-206.....	7,677,974	595,726	3,671,000
Wage board.....	2,856,400	200,600	
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:			
Public Law 90-206.....	21,009,000	1,538,000	
Public Law 90-207.....	243,000		
Administrative action.....	865,000	64,0 0	
Wage board.....	1,404,000	97, 00	
Veterans Administration:			
Public Law 90-206.....	46,631,000	3,535,00 0	
Wage board.....	6,512,000	488,000	
Administrative Conference of the United States:			
Public Law 90-206.....	6,000	500	
American Battle Monuments Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	12,659	949	
Public Law 90-207.....	5,832		
Wage board.....	38,993	10,138	
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:			
Public Law 90-206.....	91,791	6,884	
Administrative action.....	27,909	2,093	
Civil Aeronautics Board:			
Public Law 90-206.....	451,200	33,300	
Administrative action.....	16,500	1,200	
Wage board.....	3,300	200	
Civil Service Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	2,278,000	171,700	
Wage board.....	12,300	1,000	
Commission of Fine Arts:			
Public Law 90-206.....	4,900	300	
Commission on Civil Rights:			
Public Law 90-206.....	74,948	5,420	
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	307,800	24,200	38,000
Export-Import Bank of the United States:			
Public Law 90-206.....	187,984	15,242	
Farm Credit Administration:			
Public Law 90-206.....	146,000	11,000	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review:			
Public Law 90-206.....	2,585	181	
Federal Communications Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	880,094	66,206	
Federal Field Committee for Development Plan- ning in Alaska:			
Public Law 90-206.....	5,022	353	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board:			
Public Law 90-206.....	834,000	109,000	
Wage board.....	3,700	300	
Federal Maritime Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	171,945	12,610	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service:			
Public Law 90-206.....	398,500	27,500	
Federal Power Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	725,070	52,930	
Wage board.....	5,231	382	
Federal Radiation Council:			
Public Law 90-206.....	3,163	277	

THE FISCAL YEAR 1969—Continued

Administrative action	Absorption possible through—		Additional funds required		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other congressional action	Total	Requested in Title II of this document	Recommended in this Title
6,004,153			6,004,153		
8,444,700	922,000		9,366,700		5,635,000
25,220,000			25,220,000		
585,000	15,529,000		16,114,000	39,295,000	1,757,000
6,500			6,500		
35,571			35,571		33,000
113,677	15,000		128,677		
5,700			5,700		500,000
758,000	36,000	277,000	1,071,000		1,392,000
5,200			5,200		
80,368			80,368		
					370,000
31,226	172,000		203,226		
50,000		107,000	157,000		
2,766			2,766		
3,300	16,000		19,300		927,000
5,375			5,375		
730,000	102,000	115,000	947,000		
555	76,000		76,555		108,000
293,000	8,000		301,000		125,000
5,613			5,613		778,000
3,440			3,440		

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR

Organizational unit	Increase in pay and other related costs		Unabsorbed amount for payment to other appropriations
	Direct pay	Related costs	
Federal Trade Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	737,000	55,000	}
Wage board.....	5,200	390	
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	29,033	2,689	}
Wage board.....	259	19	
Historical and Memorial Commissions:			
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	2,659	213	
Lewis and Clark Trail Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	480	54	
Indian Claims Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	27,389	3,414	
Interagency Committee on Mexican American Affairs:			
Public Law 90-206.....	12,000	1,000	
Intergovernmental Commissions:			
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations:			
Public Law 90-206.....	22,500	1,700	
Appalachian Regional Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	7,300	500	
Delaware River Basin Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	1,500	100	
Interstate Commerce Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	1,123,100	76,900	}
Wage board.....	7,900	600	
National Capital Planning Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	46,500	3,500	
National Commission on Product Safety:			
Public Law 90-206.....	23,000	2,000	
National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws:			
Public Law 90-206.....	10,000	700	
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities:			
Public Law 90-206.....	54,345	4,348	
National Labor Relations Board:			
Public Law 90-206.....	1,513,800	113,500	}
Administrative action.....	123,300	8,400	
Wage board.....	7,500	500	
National Mediation Board:			
Public Law 90-206.....	48,700	3,300	
National Science Foundation:			
Public Law 90-206.....	524,395	36,708	}
Administrative action.....	155,697	10,899	
Wage board.....	1,716	120	
President's Committee on Consumer Interests:			
Public Law 90-206.....	13,400	1,000	
President's Council on Youth Opportunity:			
Public Law 90-206.....	907	73	
Railroad Retirement Board:			
Public Law 90-206.....	699,000	45,000	
Renegotiation Board:			
Public Law 90-206.....	131,000	9,000	
Securities and Exchange Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	809,000	60,000	}
Wage board.....	3,900	300	

THE FISCAL YEAR 1969—Continued

Absorption possible through—				Additional funds required	
Administrative action	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other congressional action	Total	Requested in Title II of this document	Recommended in this Title
297,590			297,590	500,000	
					32,000
2,872			2,872		
534			534		
30,803			30,803		
13,000			13,000		
24,200			24,200		
7,800			7,800		
1,600			1,600		
8,500	382,000		390,500		818,000
	20,000		20,000		30,000
					25,000
10,700			10,700		
58,693			58,693		
318,000	848,000		1,166,000		601,000
52,000			52,000		
729,535			729,535		
14,400			14,400		
980			980		
228,000		516,000	744,000		
					140,000
4,200	199,000		203,200		670,000

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR

Organizational unit	Increase in pay and other related costs		Unabsorbed amount for payment to other appropriations
	Direct pay	Related costs	
Selective Service System:			
Public Law 90-206.....	306,484	22,000	}
Public Law 90-207.....	341,000		
Administrative action.....	1,364,516	105,000	
Small Business Administration:			
Public Law 90-206.....	2,143,000	167,000	
Smithsonian Institution:			
Public Law 90-206.....	790,455	58,732	}
Wage board.....	214,611	16,820	
Subversive Activities Control Board:			
Public Law 90-206.....	7,495	505	
Tariff Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	161,000	10,460	}
Wage board.....	1,400	100	
Tax Court of the United States:			
Public Law 90-206.....	110,297	7,850	
Temporary Study Commissions:			
Atlantic-Pacific Interoceanic Canal Study Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	5,097	433	
Commission on Obscenity and Pornography:			
Public Law 90-206.....	8,093	609	
Public Land Law Review Commission:			
Public Law 90-206.....	43,152	3,236	
Tennessee Valley Authority:			
Administrative action.....	4,963,400	895,200	
United States Information Agency:			
Public Law 90-206.....	3,787,663	265,626	}
Wage board.....	198,991	11,581	
United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship:			
Public Law 90-206.....	7,300	500	
Water Resources Council:			
Public Law 90-206.....	24,027	1,922	}
Administrative action.....	4,278	342	
District of Columbia:			
Public Law 90-206.....	5,364,290	353,319	}
Public Law 90-319.....	12,553,991	816,009	
Public Law 90-320.....	6,449,422	420,578	
Wage board.....	3,181,615	206,805	
Grand total.....	1,938,060,789	161,146,501	38,622,382

THE FISCAL YEAR 1969—Continued

Absorption possible through—				Additional funds required	
Administrative action	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other congressional action	Total	Requested in Title II of this document	Recommended in this Title
				2,139,000	
1,627,000	265,000		1,892,000		418,000
178,618	148,000		326,618		754,000
8,000			8,000		
130,960	42,000		172,960		
38,147	77,000		115,147		3,000
5,530			5,530		
8,702			8,702		
46,388			46,388		
5,858,600			5,858,600		
286,221			286,221		4,367,000
7,800			7,800		
30,569			30,569		
869,029			869,029	22,039,000	6,438,000
331,252,057	140,959,000	38,311,000	510,522,057	148,747,400	1,478,560,215

ANALYSIS OF PAY INCREASE COSTS FOR

Organizational unit	Increase in pay and other related costs		Unabsorbed amount for payment to other appropriations
	Direct pay	Related costs	
Summary of Public Laws:			
Public Law 90-206.....	882,258,466	75,798,014	} 38,622,382
Public Law 90-207.....	864,370,232	72,601,700	
Public Law 90-319.....	13,720,991	891,009	
Public Law 90-320.....	7,337,552	484,448	
Administrative action.....	17,878,498	1,732,062	
Wage board.....	152,495,050	9,639,268	
Grand total.....	1,938,060,789	161,146,501	38,622,382
Deduct amounts out of District of Columbia funds.....	27,549,318	1,796,711	-----
Net total.....	1,910,511,471	159,349,790	38,622,382
Deduct payments between accounts.....			38,622,382
Total, Federal Budget.....	1,910,511,471	159,349,790	-----

THE FISCAL YEAR 1969—Continued

Absorption possible through—				Additional funds required	
Administrative action	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other congressional action	Total	Requested in Title II of this document	Recommended in this Title
331,252,057	140,959,000	38,311,000	510,522,057	148,747,400	1,478,560,215
331,252,057	140,959,000	38,311,000	510,522,057	148,747,400	1,478,560,215
869,029	-----	-----	869,029	22,039,000	6,438,000
330,383,028 38,622,382	140,959,000	38,311,000	509,653,028 38,622,382	126,708,400	1,472,122,215
291,760,646	140,959,000	38,311,000	471,030,646	126,708,400	1,472,122,215

TITLE IV
COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT
COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

For an additional amount for "Compensation of the President",
\$44,584.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$44,584 for the fiscal year 1969 costs of increasing the President's annual salary from \$100,000 to \$200,000 under Public Law 91- —, of January —, 1969.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Budget Appendix page	Heading	Request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
49	Compensation of the President... (Delete the paragraph under the above heading and in- sert in lieu thereof the fol- lowing:) For compensation of the President, including an expense allowance at the rate of \$50,000 per annum, as authorized by [the Act of January 19, 1949 (3 U.S.C. 102)], \$150,000], \$250,- 000.	\$150, 000	\$100, 000	\$250, 000

This proposed amendment would provide funds for the fiscal year 1970 to increase the compensation of the President from \$100,000 to \$200,000, as authorized by Public Law 91—, of January —, 1969.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET AND PROPOSED
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET AND PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATIONS, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE
BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING ACT, 1921, AS AMENDED

MARCH 4, 1969.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered
to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 4, 1969.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: The Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, requires that I submit for the consideration of the Congress such amendments to the budget and proposed supplemental appropriations as in my judgment are necessary. The accompanying amendments reflect those actions recommended to date by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who is in the early stages of a comprehensive review of major 1970 budget requests. They are amendments to the

—request for appropriations transmitted in the 1970 budget, and

—supplemental requests for appropriations transmitted to the Congress on January 17, 1969 (House Document No. 91-50).

These amendments involve decreases of \$6,081,000 for the fiscal year 1969, and \$1,252,000 for the fiscal year 1970.

The details of these amendments, the reasons they are proposed, and an explanation of why they are submitted at this time are all set forth in the enclosed letter to me from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I concur with his comments and observations.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1969.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration amendments to the requests for appropriations transmitted in the 1970 budget and to the supplemental requests for appropriations transmitted to the Congress on January 17, 1969 (H. Doc. 91-50), involving decreases of \$6,081,000 for the fiscal year 1969, and \$1,252,000 for the fiscal year 1970, for the following agencies:

Agency	Net decreases in 1969 supplemental request (H. Doc. No. 91-50)	Decreases for 1970 included in 1970 budget
Department of Agriculture.....	\$1,491,000	
Panama Canal.....		\$227,000
Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	250,000	
Department of State.....		1,025,000
Treasury Department.....	4,139,000	
National Labor Relations Board.....	201,000	
Total.....	6,081,000	1,252,000

Your memorandum of January 25, 1969, asked the head of every executive department and agency to make a careful and thorough review of the budget requests sent to the Congress by the previous administration. This review was to be completed within 30 days. Many of the agencies, particularly the larger ones, are still in the process of reviewing their programs. However, at the request of the Appropriations Committees to expedite these reviews, we are submitting at this time those amendments which can be considered immediately. As other reviews are completed, we will be forwarding additional recommendations.

Amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1970 are as follows.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Budget appendix page	Heading	1970 request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
364	Capital outlay.....	\$2,600,000	-\$227,000	\$2,373,000

The reduction results from elimination of minor capital projects originally planned for 1970. These projects need not be initiated at this time.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Budget appendix page	Heading	1970 request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
713	Salaries and expenses.....	\$208,300,000	-\$300,000	\$208,000,000

This amendment deletes funds for all new American positions requested in the 1970 budget under this appropriation. These staffing requirements can be met within the Department's present personnel complement.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Budget appendix page	Heading	Request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
719	Contributions to international organizations -----	\$131,130,000	—\$725,000	\$130,405,000

This amendment results from lower U.S. assessments than previously estimated due to final action on the budgets of certain international organizations.

Amendments to the supplemental requests for appropriations for the fiscal year 1969 (H. Doc. 91-50), are as follows:

A. Delete the requests for the following appropriations under "Title II—Other Proposed Supplemental Appropriations for Various Programs" for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and insert the following proposed appropriations under "Title III—Increased Pay Costs":

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

"Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", \$2,897,000; (and release of \$400,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

The \$1,000,000 previously requested for poultry inspection under the Wholesome Poultry Products Act (Public Law 90-492) will not be required. The rate at which the States are entering the program is slower than anticipated, and some of the funds provided for the meat inspection program can be used, without impairing that program, to fund the poultry inspection program. The revised request of \$2,897,000 in budget authority and \$400,000 in proposed release of reserves is required for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

"Salaries and expenses", \$280,000.

This reduced request, involving a reduction of \$250,000 in the previously transmitted supplemental, is possible because the administrative costs of initiating the program of guaranteed loans for the development of new communities can be absorbed within existing resources. The remainder is needed for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

B. Substitute the following requests for the corresponding requests transmitted under "Title III—Increased Pay Costs", in House Document 91-50, which are hereby canceled:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,300,000, of which \$13,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Agricultural Research Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, \$158,000 from the amount reserved under "Payments and expenses", Cooperative State Research Service pursuant to said section 201, \$2,000 from the amount reserved under "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses", Federal Extension Service pursuant to said section 201, \$150,000 from the amount reserved under "Payments to States and Possessions", Consumer and Marketing Service, pursuant to said section 201 and \$12,000 from the amount reserved under "Cropland adjustment program", Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service pursuant to said section 201; (and release of \$156,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Farmers Home Administration, pursuant to said section 201).

This revised request, involving a reduction of \$491,000 in budget authority, is possible because additional reserves have been established as required by section 201 of Public Law 90-364. Under this revised request, the added reserves are proposed for use for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND

"Limitation on general and administrative expenses", (increase of \$130,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and release of \$20,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This substitution involves a reduction of \$41,000 in the request previously transmitted for the limitation on administrative expenses. Prospective savings in other areas permit the reduction.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

HEALTH MANPOWER

"Health manpower education and utilization"; (release of \$201,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This substitution involves a reduction of \$102,000 in the previously requested release of Public Law 90-364, section 201 reserves. Release of these reserves should have been requested for "Dental health activities".

DISEASE PREVENTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

"Air pollution"; (release of \$519,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

HEALTH SERVICES

"Community health services"; (release of \$590,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Patient care and special health services", \$2,193,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, (and release of \$91,000 reserved under "Patient care and special health services" pursuant to said section 201);

"Hospital construction activities"; (release of \$169,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Excluding "Health manpower", the foregoing substitutions involve reductions of \$143,000 in previously requested releases of Public Law 90-364, section 201 reserves. These reductions are possible because of more recent estimates of pay costs that can be absorbed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MORTGAGE CREDIT

"Limitation on administrative and non-administrative expenses, Federal housing administration"; (increase of \$465,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and increase of \$2,000,000 in the limitation on non-administrative expenses);

This is a reduction of \$1,770,000 in the request previously transmitted for the limitation on non-administrative expenses and anticipates higher absorption of the increased pay costs through administrative action.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$257,000; (and release of \$134,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This substitution, involving an increase of \$75,000 in the request previously transmitted, is proposed for anticipated increases in executive salaries as a result of the President's recommendations for increases in executive, legislative, and judicial salaries in accordance with section 225(h) of Public Law 90-206, approved December 16, 1967.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$450,000; (and release of \$564,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This revised request, involving a reduction of \$314,000 in budget authority, is possible because additional reserves have been established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364. The added reserves are proposed for use for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

"Compliance", \$3,300,000; (and release of \$20,360,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This revised request, involving a reduction of \$3,510,000 in budget authority, is possible because additional reserves have been established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364. The added reserves are proposed for use for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on administrative expenses", (increase of \$97,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

A higher absorption from available funds permits this reduction of \$10,000 in the previous request.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$400,000; (and release of \$848,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

A higher absorption from available funds permits this reduction of \$201,000 in the previous request.

TARIFF COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", (release of \$53,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This substitution requests release of an additional \$11,000 of Public Law 90-364, section 201 reserves to help meet the additional costs of the new executive pay increases.

C. The following requests transmitted under "Title III—Increased Pay Costs", are hereby canceled:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE

HEALTH SERVICES

"Emergency health activities"; (release of \$202,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Educational broadcasting facilities"; (release of \$18,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

These cancellations, involving reductions of \$220,000 in previously requested releases of section 201 reserves, are possible because of more recent estimates of increased pay costs that can be absorbed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

"Salaries and expenses", \$390,000;

The entire \$390,000 previously requested is not needed because of revised estimates of tax refund payments workload.

D. Add the following request to those transmitted under "Title III—Increased Pay Costs", in House Document 91-50:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE

HEALTH MANPOWER

"Dental health activities"; (Release of \$102,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Release of section 201 reserves in the amount of \$102,000 was inadvertently requested under House Document 91-50 for "Health manpower education and utilization" and should have been requested for "Dental health activities".

I recommend that the foregoing amendments be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT P. MAYO, *Director.*

BUDGET AMENDMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1969 AND 1970

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET AND PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

MARCH 27, 1969.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 26, 1969.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: The Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, requires that I submit for the consideration of the Congress such amendments to the budget and proposed supplemental appropriations as in my judgment are necessary.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has virtually completed a detailed review of 1969 supplemental requests now pending before the Congress. The accompanying 1969 amendments show the results of that review to date, including:

- reductions of \$148,469,000 in budget authority
- new requests totaling \$67,210,000 for natural disasters, payments required under the law, crime control and other purposes.

I am also proposing amendments to the 1970 budget which will help provide relief from higher prices on lumber and plywood.

As required by law, I am also submitting 1968 and 1969 increases for the legislative and judicial branches totaling \$5,528,497.

The details of these amendments and supplemental appropriations, the reasons they are proposed, and an explanation of why they are

submitted at this time are all set forth in the enclosed letter to me from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I concur with his comments and observations.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration proposed supplemental appropriations and amendments for the fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970 in the following amounts:

	Budget authority	Release of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other pro- posals not increasing budget authority
Legislative branch:			
1968.....	126,900		
1969.....	3,020,597		
The judiciary:			
1968.....	10,000		
1969.....	2,371,000		
Executive branch:			
1969.....	-81,259,000	837,000	-19,769,000
1970.....	3,960,000		14,000,000
Total:			
1968.....	136,900		
1969.....	-75,867,403	837,000	-19,769,000
1970.....	3,960,000		14,000,000

These revisions will not cause the limitations established by Public Law 90-364 to be exceeded.

For the legislative branch the new 1969 budget authority requested consists of:

New supplemental requests herein.....	\$2,433,270
Revisions to title III of H. Doc. 91-50, "Increased Pay Costs".....	587,327
Total.....	3,020,597

For the judiciary the new 1969 budget authority requested consists of:

New supplemental requests herein.....	\$431,000
Revisions to title II of H. Doc. 91-50, "Other Proposed Supplemental Appropriations for Various Programs for the Fiscal Year ending June 30, 1969".....	1,870,000
Revisions to title III of H. Doc. 91-50, "Increased Pay Costs".....	70,000
Total.....	2,371,000

For the executive branch, as you know, I have been conducting a comprehensive review of the major 1970 budget requests now before the Congress. Although the review has not been completed, I have identified certain 1969 adjustments, increases and decreases, which can be forwarded to the Congress at this time. I am also including

additional amounts for 1969 and 1970 to carry out your program to relieve price pressures on lumber and plywood. The reductions I am recommending more than offset the increases needed to provide for critical emergencies and for essential services required by law.

Recommended revisions for the executive branch are as follows:

1970 BUDGET AMENDMENTS

	Change in budget authority	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other pro- posals not increasing budget authority
Lumber program:			
Department of Agriculture.....	\$3, 460, 000	-----	\$14, 000, 000
Department of the Interior.....	500, 000	-----	
Total 1970 amendments.....	3, 960, 000	-----	14, 000, 000

To provide relief from higher prices for lumber and plywood, the following 1970 changes are proposed:

- An increase of \$3,460,000 to the Department of Agriculture to provide additional timber from national forests for immediate sale. A supplemental appropriation of \$460,000 in 1969 is also being requested to initiate this program immediately.
- An increase of \$14,000,000 to the Department of Agriculture to liquidate contract authority required to provide for construction of an additional 500 miles of forest roads needed to fulfill the objectives of this program.
- An increase of \$500,000 to the Department of the Interior to make available additional quantities of timber from Indian owned lands. A supplemental appropriation request of \$150,000 in 1969 is also being requested to initiate this program immediately.

The 1969 requests for this program are included in the table below with other 1969 requests:

1969 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS IN RELATION TO PENDING H. DOCS. 91-50 AND 91-85

	Change in budget authority	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other pro- posals not increasing budget authority
New supplemental requests.....	\$57, 795, 000	-----	
Revisions to H. Docs. 91-50 and 91-85:			
Title I, "Military Operations in Southeast Asia".....	—134, 600, 000	-----	
Title II, "Other Proposed Supplemental Appropriations for Various Programs for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969".....	4, 871, 000	\$834, 000	—\$20, 000, 000
Title III, "Increased Pay Costs".....	—9, 325, 000	3, 000	231, 000
Total 1969 adjustments.....	—81, 259, 000	837, 000	—19, 769, 000

1969 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS—SUMMARY OF REDUCTIONS
AND INCREASES

	Change in budget authority	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	Other pro- posals not increasing authority
Summary:			
Gross reductions.....	-\$148,469,000	\$837,000	-\$19,769,000
Increases:			
Lumber program.....	610,000		
Crime prevention and control.....	2,501,000		
Natural disasters.....	35,648,000		
Mandatory payments.....	25,018,000		
Pay increases.....	1,056,000		
Other essential purposes.....	2,377,000		
Subtotal, increases.....	67,210,000		
Net reductions.....	-81,259,000	\$837,000	-19,769,000

The major recommended decrease, \$140,700,000, reduces the request of January 17, 1969, contained in House Document No. 91-50 for the Department of Defense, and results primarily from the application of miscellaneous savings to the previous requests for Southeast Asia operations requirements. Other significant decreases are in Labor, Commerce, General Services Administration, and the Peace Corps.

I am recommending that you propose release of \$837,000 in reserves accruing under section 201 of Public Law 90-364 to be applied to additional appropriation requirements. I am also recommending decreases totaling \$19,769,000 in the amount requested in House Document No. 91-50 under the heading "Other Proposals Not Increasing Budget Authority." The major item in this reduction is a reestimate of the amounts needed to liquidate obligations for the Redwood National Park in California.

Increases of \$2,501,000 are recommended for the Justice Department as part of your recently announced *crime prevention and control* program.

Increases required for *natural disasters* include:

- \$35,000,000 to provide additional funding for the Disaster Relief appropriation to meet current and future demands during the remainder of 1969. Recent disasters, such as the California floods and mudslides, have created severe demands on this appropriation.
- \$500,000 for the Department of the Interior to repair facilities damaged during the California floods.
- \$148,000 for the National Transportation Safety Board to handle the increased number of major aviation accidents requiring investigation.

Increases requested for *mandatory payments* include:

- \$20,000,000 for the Labor Department for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen; enactment of this appropriation will make unnecessary the questionable practice of planning to use subsequent years' money to cover current year payments when it is known that available funds are inadequate.
- \$4,800,000 for the Labor Department for additional payments for employees compensation claims and expenses.

—\$218,000 for the Department of Agriculture to cover additional mandatory Federal contributions to the retirement fund for State extension personnel.

An additional amount of \$1,056,000 is required for recently enacted *pay increases* which cannot be absorbed or covered through existing reserves.

Supplemental appropriations are also sought for the following *other essential purposes*:

- \$200,000 to increase the staff capability of the National Security Council;
- \$777,000 for the Office of Emergency Preparedness for telecommunications research;
- \$1,400,000 for the Department of Agriculture to prevent a massive migration of screw-worms in the spring.

I recommend that the foregoing items be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT S. MAYO.

Budget amendments for the fiscal year 1970.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

Budget Appendix page	Heading	Request pending	Amendment	Revised request
197	Forest protection and utilization, Forest land management.	\$196, 518, 000	\$3, 460, 000	\$199, 978, 000
200	Forest roads and trails (Liquidation of con- tract authority)	99, 570, 000	14, 000, 000	113, 570, 000

These amendments for the Forest Service will permit additional sale preparation of an estimated 640 million board feet of stumpage from National Forest land and provide for construction of an additional 500 miles of roads needed for timber management objectives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Budget Appendix page	Heading	Request pending	Amendment	Revised request
561	Resources management.....	\$55, 192, 000	\$500, 000	\$55, 692, 000

These additional funds will provide for activities in management of Indian timber lands which will assist in increasing timber production.

Proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and investigations", fiscal year 1968, \$126,900.

As provided by statute, proposed supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch are submitted without change.

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

For an additional amount for "Printing and binding Supreme Court reports", \$27,000.

For an additional amount for "Printing and binding Supreme Court reports", fiscal year 1968, \$10,000.

As provided by statute, proposed supplemental appropriations for the judiciary are submitted without change.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$200,000.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide for an additional 13 full-time permanent positions and related expenses in accordance with the President's plan to revitalize the National Security Council.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, telecommunications", \$777,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide for experimentation to determine the extent of interference between satellite and terrestrial communications systems.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide relief for areas devastated by natural disasters, such as the California floods and mudslides which occurred in January 1969.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", for "Plant and animal disease and pest control", \$1,400,000.

Additional funds are needed to maintain the barrier zone against the entry of screwworm flies from Mexico. Weather conditions were unusually favorable for the insect during the first half of 1969. Additional funds are needed to increase the production and release of sterile flies to combat a massive spring buildup of this costly livestock pest in the United States.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on March 20 1969.

EXTENSION SERVICE

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses", for "Retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents", \$218,000.

Additional funds are necessary for the Extension Service to cover the mandatory Federal contributions to the retirement fund for State extension personnel. These payments are tied to increases in salaries of State personnel.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$200,000, to remain available until expended.

Funds are requested to provide for repair of storm damaged facilities at six wildlife refuges in California.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND
EX-SERVICEMEN

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$20,000,000.

Public Law 91-2, signed February 9, 1969, provided a 1969 supplemental appropriation of \$36,000,000. Current experience indicates that an additional \$20,000,000 will be required for 1969 benefit payments.

Substitute the following requests for the corresponding requests transmitted under "Title I—Military Operations in Southeast Asia," in House Document No. 91-50, which are hereby canceled:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Army", \$136,200,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Navy", \$21,500,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Air Force", \$146,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Army", \$144,600,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$307,300,000.

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army", \$717,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The application of miscellaneous program changes against South-east Asia requirements results in a net reduction of \$25,500,000.

The following requests transmitted under "Title I—Military Operations in Southeast Asia," in House Document No. 91-50, are hereby canceled:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

"Military personnel, Marine Corps"-----	\$6, 500, 000
"Aircraft procurement, Air Force"-----	\$102, 600, 000

The cancellation of these requests results in a net reduction of \$109,100,000.

Substitute the following requests for the corresponding requests transmitted under "Title II—Other Proposed Supplemental Appropriations for Various Programs for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969", in House Document No. 91-50, which are hereby canceled:

THE JUDICIARY

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$155,850.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER
JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", \$2,075,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of the United States Courts", \$141,500, and, in addition, \$10,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Expenses of referees", fiscal year 1969.

As provided by statute, proposed supplemental appropriations for the judiciary are submitted without change. These substitutions involve increases of \$1,870,000 from the previous request.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$107,000.

This revised request involves a net reduction of \$28,000 in the previous request. The amount previously requested for economic

studies is being reduced from \$135,000 to \$65,000. This reduction of \$70,000 is partially offset by increases of (1) \$31,000 for increased pay under Public Law 90-206 and (2) \$11,000 for new executive pay increases.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on March 14, 1969.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For an additional amount for "Forest protection and utilization", as follows: "Forest land management", \$25,028,000; "Forest research", \$1,564,000; and "State and private forestry cooperation", \$124,000: *(and release of \$1,676,000 reserved under "Forest protection and utilization" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

This substitution would provide \$460,000 for additional sale preparation of an estimated 270 million board feet of stumpage from National Forest land in 1969.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", \$6,800,000.

This revised request, involving a reduction of \$3,100,000, reflects a more feasible training program for the Marine Corps Reserve.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$10,410,000; *and in addition, \$1,803,000 (including \$175,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Water supply and water pollution control", fiscal year 1969; (and release of \$275,000 reserved under "Management of lands and resources" pursuant to said section 201).*

This substitution, involving a reduction of \$450,000 from the previous request, is possible because additional reserves have been established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364 which can be used to offset increased pay and costs of emergency fire suppression on public lands during the 1968 fire season.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", \$2,769,000: *(and release of \$426,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

The substitution provides an additional \$150,000 for management of timber resources on Indian lands to assist in increased production of timber.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For a repayable advance to the "Land and water conservation fund", as authorized by section 4(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 460l-7), for liquidation of obligations incurred against such fund pursuant to law, \$19,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For an additional amount for "Land and water conservation", to be derived from the "Land and water conservation fund" and to remain available until expended *for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to section 3(b)(1) of the Act of October 2, 1968 (Public Law 90-545), \$19,000,000.*

The recommended reduction of \$20,000,000 in this supplemental is based on revised, but still preliminary, estimates of the amounts needed to liquidate obligations incurred as a result of the acquisition of real property within the boundaries of the Redwood National Park, California. Four of the major timber companies affected have indicated that they would prefer to be compensated in land and timber, rather than cash, to the extent possible.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", \$1,353,000; *(and release of \$139,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", \$2,479,000; *(and release of \$195,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

These substitutions, involving reductions from the previous request of \$139,000 for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and \$20,000 for the National Park Service, are possible because additional reserves have been established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364 which can be used to offset portions of the previous request.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", \$1,537,000, *and, in addition \$100,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and ex-*

penses", Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$100,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities" pursuant to said section 201);

This substitution, involving an increase of \$216,000 in the previous request, is proposed to enable the Criminal Division and the Tax Division to cope more effectively with the increasing level of criminal activity, particularly organized crime.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", \$2,810,000; (and release of \$150,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This substitution, involving an increase of \$1,313,000 in the previous request, is for proposed staff increases and related costs and unanticipated increases in overtime, premium pay, transcripts and guard hire, all related to the government-wide effort to cope more effectively with the increasing level of criminal activities.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION CLAIMS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses", \$15,900,000.

This substitution, involving an increase of \$4,800,000 in the request previously transmitted, is proposed for mandatory increases in benefit costs.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$650,000; (and release of \$81,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

This substitution seeks the release of \$81,000 of reserves established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364, which were not included in the previous request of this amount; \$60,000 is to be used to offset part of the moving and rental costs related to newly acquired space, and \$21,000 is to meet the additional cost of the new executive pay increases.

Delete the request for the following appropriation under "Title II—Other Proposed Supplemental Appropriations for Various Programs for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969" in House Document No. 91-50, and insert the following proposed appropriation under "Title III—Increased Pay Costs":

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration: "Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses"; (release of \$313,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This substitution involves a reduction of \$2,143,000 in budget authority and \$87,000 in the previously requested release of Public Law 90-364, section 201 reserves. The amounts previously requested for the Labor Mobility and Placement Assistance (bonding) activities will not be required in the fiscal year 1969. The revised request of \$313,000 in proposed release of section 201 reserves is required for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

Add the following proposed supplemental appropriations for increased pay costs to "Title III—Increased Pay Costs" in House Document No 91-50.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate: "Compensation of the Vice President and Senators", \$458,270;

House of Representatives: Salaries, mileage for the Members, and expense allowance of the Speaker: "Compensation of Members", \$1,975,000;

THE JUDICIARY

Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services: "Salaries of referees", \$404,000;

As provided by statute, proposed supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary are submitted without change. These additional items provide increases over the previous request of \$2,433,270 for the legislative branch and \$404,000 for the judiciary.

Substitute the following requests for the corresponding requests transmitted under "Title III—Increased Pay Costs" in House Document No. 91-50, as amended in House Document No. 91-85, which are hereby canceled:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senate:

"Salaries, officers and employees", \$2,147,837;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", \$21,905;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Senate policy committees", \$27,190;

"Inquiries and investigations", \$370,640, including \$14,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;

Joint items:

"Joint Economic Committee", \$22,025;

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", \$17,820;

"Joint Committee on Printing", \$12,425;

House of Representatives:

"Office of the Parliamentarian", \$12,935;

"Office of the Postmaster", \$40,875;

Special minority employees:

"House Democratic steering committee", \$3,760;

"House Republican conference", \$3,760;

"Office of the legislative counsel", \$49,100;

"Members' clerk hire", \$3,090,000;

Contingent expenses of the House:

"Revision of laws", \$1,490;

Joint items: "Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation", \$27,250;

Botanic Garden: "Salaries and expenses", \$22,500;

Library of Congress:

"Salaries and expenses", \$766,000;

Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$220,000;

THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States: "Salaries", \$120,000;
Court of Claims: "Salaries and expenses", \$64,000;

As provided by statute, proposed supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary are submitted without change. These substitutions involve increases from the previous request of \$587,327 for the legislative branch and \$70,000 for the judiciary.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Special Representative for Trade Negotiations: "Salaries and expenses", \$32,000;

This revised request, involving an increase of \$7,000 in budget authority, represents increased costs for executive pay.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Cooperative State Research Service: "Payments and expenses";
(*Release of \$81,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364*);

This substitution involves the release of reserves established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364 to meet increased pay and related costs rather than the transfer of this amount from "Penalty mail costs" as originally proposed. Available funds under "Penalty mail costs" are being transferred to other accounts to meet increased pay costs.

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$224,000, of which \$36,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Payments and expenses", Cooperative State Research Service, (and release of \$30,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This substitution involves transfer of \$36,000 from "Payments and expenses", Cooperative State Research Service, to this account to meet executive pay costs resulting from salary reforms for the Office of the Secretary and staff offices.

Farmers Home Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$2,144,000, of which \$13,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Agricultural Research Service pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, \$158,000 from "Payments and expenses", Cooperative State Research Service (including \$44,000 from the amount reserved pursuant to said section 201), \$2,000 from the amount reserved under "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses", Federal Extension Service pursuant to said section 201, \$150,000 from "Payments to States and possessions", Consumer and Marketing Service, and \$12,000 from "Cropland adjustment program", Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service; (and release of \$156,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Farmers Home Administration pursuant to said section 201);

This language is in substitution for language currently contained in House Document No. 91-85 and involves the reduction of \$156,000 from the previous request for increased pay and related costs. In addition, it deletes previous references to section 201 reserves inad-

vertently included for several of the items to be transferred to this account.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

General Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$293,000, of which \$75,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Operations and administration", Economic Development Assistance;

This substitution involves a net decrease of \$27,000 in budget authority from the previous request. Included in this net decrease is an increase of \$48,000 for executive pay, which is more than offset by the proposed transfer of \$75,000 from the Economic Development Administration to this account.

Office of Business Economics: "Salaries and expenses", \$75,000, to be derived by transfer from "Operations and administration", Economic Development Assistance; (and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This revised request, involving a reduction of \$75,000 in budget authority, is possible because the amount previously requested for budget authority may now be obtained by transfer.

Environmental Science Services Administration: "Salaries and expenses", \$3,254,000; (and release of \$786,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This revised request, involving a reduction of \$235,000 in budget authority, is possible because \$105,000 of the amount previously requested for budget authority can be absorbed within available funds. The remaining \$130,000 of the \$235,000 previously requested is expected to come from additional reserves that have been established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364.

Maritime Administration: "Maritime training", \$100,000; (and release of \$99,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This revised request, involving a reduction of \$99,000 in budget authority, is possible because additional reserves have been established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364. The added reserves are proposed for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Military personnel: "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$61,500,000;

A higher absorption from available funds permits a \$3,000,000 reduction in the previous request.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: "Management and investigations of resources", \$628,000; (and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

National Park Service: "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", \$668,000; (and release of \$115,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:

"Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation", \$9,000, which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Saline water conversion", fiscal year 1969, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

"General administrative expenses", \$78,000; and in addition \$4,000 to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Operation and maintenance", Southwestern Power Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

These substitutions, involving reductions of \$60,000 from the previous request, are possible because additional reserves have been established under provisions of section 201 of Public Law 90-364 which can be used to offset increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

Office of the Secretary: "Salaries and expenses", \$454,000;

This substitution involves an increase of \$46,000 for executive salary increases.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Bureau of Labor Statistics: "Salaries and expenses", \$180,000, *of which \$87,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Office of the Manpower Administrator, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$700,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Bureau of Labor Statistics, pursuant to said section 201);*

This revised request, involving a reduction of \$87,000 in budget authority, is possible because of the proposed transfer of reserves which were previously requested for release under another head. Under this revised request, the added reserves are proposed for use for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs: "Salaries and expenses", \$6,787,000, and, in addition, \$750,000 to be derived by transfer from "Chamizal settlement", International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and \$83,000 from "Rama Road, Nicaragua";

International organizations and conferences: "Missions to international organizations", \$153,000;

These substitutions, involving increases of \$805,000 for Salaries and expenses and \$35,000 for Missions to international organizations, are required for increases in executive pay. These costs are proportionately large for the Department of State because its appropriations finance over 100 ambassadors in the executive pay categories.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", \$300,000; *(and release of \$95,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

A higher absorption from available funds permits this reduction of \$200,000 in the previous request.

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", \$119,000;

This substitution, involving an increase of \$13,000 in the previous request, is proposed to meet the additional costs of the new executive pay increases.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Civil Service Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$1,364,000; *(and release of \$89,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

This substitution to the previous request proposes a \$28,000 reduction in budget authority and a \$53,000 increase in release of Public Law 90-364, section 201 reserves. The reduction in budget authority is possible because additional reserves have been established under section 201 of Public Law 90-364. The remaining \$25,000 requested release of reserves is proposed to meet the additional costs of the new executive pay increases.

Federal Communications Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$970,000; *(and release of \$16,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

This substitution, involving an increase of \$43,000 in the request previously transmitted, is proposed to meet the additional costs of the new executive pay increases.

Federal Maritime Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$90,000; *(and release of \$76,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

This substitution, involving a reduction of \$18,000 from the previous request, is proposed because prospective savings in other activities permit the reduction.

Securities and Exchange Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$694,000; *(and release of \$199,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

This substitution, involving an increase of \$24,000 in the request previously transmitted, is proposed to meet the additional costs of the new executive pay increases.

Smithsonian Institution: "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", \$30,000; *(and release of \$23,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

This substitution, involving a decrease of \$29,000 from the previous request, is proposed because of savings now anticipated.

Tax Court of the United States: "Salaries and expenses", \$86,000; *(and release of \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);*

This substitution, involving an increase of \$83,000 in the previous request, is proposed to meet the additional costs of the new judicial pay increases.

United States Information Agency: "Salaries and expenses", \$3,500,000;

This substitution involves a reduction of \$867,000 from the previous request and results from scheduled decreases in overseas personnel occurring more rapidly than originally estimated.

Delete the requests for the following appropriations under "Title III—Increased Pay Costs" in House Document No. 91-50, and insert the following proposed appropriations under "Title II—Other Proposed Supplemental Appropriations for Various Programs for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969":

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

The amount required to be advanced from "Operations and administration" to the Small Business Administration during the current fiscal year for the processing of loan applications is hereby reduced to \$1,200,000; (and release of \$116,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

This substitution involves an \$800,000 reduction in the amount which may be advanced from this appropriation to the Small Business Administration for loan processing services. It will eliminate the need for \$650,000 in budget authority requested in the previous document for increased pay costs and will make available \$150,000 for transfer to other accounts to help meet increased pay costs.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations, and research", \$2,092,000, of which \$300,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

This substitution, involving an increase of \$300,000, is required to repair and replace stream-gaging installations damaged and destroyed during the record-breaking and destructive floods which hit southern and central California during the period of January 11, 1969, through January 27, 1969. The funds requested would remain available until the end of fiscal year 1970 for efficient operation of the emergency repair and replacement program. The amount requested for increased pay costs under this appropriation in House Document No. 91-50, \$1,792,000, is still required.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,422,000; (and release of \$400,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

This substitution, involving an increase of \$972,000 in the previous request, is for additional staff to control the rapidly increasing incidence of drug abuse, particularly in the Washington, D.C. area and especially in relation to organized crime. Funds are also requested for equipment and instrumentation of five regional laboratories.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$298,000;
(and release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

This substitution, involving an increase of \$148,000, is the result of a substantial increase in 1969 in the number of major aviation accidents requiring full-scale investigations. Eleven such investigations were conducted in fiscal year 1968 as compared to 18 in the first 7 months of fiscal year 1969.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. This action was reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on March 13, 1969.

The following requests transmitted under "Title III—Increased Pay Costs," in House Document No. 91-50, are hereby canceled:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Peace Corps: "Salaries and expenses"----- \$1, 100, 000

This cancellation results from reductions in the research program, in vehicle purchases, in School Partnership Program costs, and in the estimated number of new trainees for 1969.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service"----- \$1, 358, 000

The entire \$1,358,000 previously requested for the Federal Supply Service is not needed because more recent estimates indicate that the entire amount for increased pay costs can be absorbed.



PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND
OTHER PROVISIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND
1969

COMMUNICATION

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO AND CHANGES IN THE REQUESTS FOR
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEARS
1968 AND 1969

MAY 12, 1969.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to
be printed

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 12, 1969.

HON. SPIRO T. AGNEW,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I ask the Congress to consider additions to
and changes in the requests for supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal years 1968 and 1969 as follows:

- \$172,600,000 for mandatory payments to veterans;
- \$30,353,000 for Federal agency expenses of recent storms and
floods;
- \$17,305,407 in budget authority and \$24,651,000 in other
proposals for essential needs of the Executive Branch and
- \$1,700,000 for fiscal year 1968 and 1969 needs of the Judiciary.

The details of all of these proposals, and the reasons therefor, are set
forth in the enclosed letter to me from the Director of the Bureau of
the Budget. I concur with his comments and observations.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1969.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration additions and changes to proposed supplemental appropriations. These items increase amounts requested for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 as follows:

	Budget authority	Release of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other proposals not increasing budget authority
The Judiciary:			
1968.....	\$850,000		
1969.....	850,000		
Executive Branch: 1969.....	220,258,407	\$4,000	\$24,647,000
Total:			
1968.....	850,000		
1969.....	221,108,407	4,000	24,647,000

Both items for the Judiciary are to meet unanticipated costs of the court-appointed counsel and are submitted without change as required by law.

For the Executive branch, the requests are distributed as follows:

	Budget authority	Release of reserves under Public Law 90-364	Other proposals not increasing budget authority
New supplemental requests:			
Title II (H. Doc. 91-50).....	\$25,950,000		\$147,000
Title III (H. Doc. 91-50).....		\$4,000	
Claims and Judgments (H. Doc. 91-101).....	228,407		
Revisions to H. Doc. 91-50 and H. Doc. 91-94:			
Title II.....	181,564,000		
Title III.....	-119,000		8,000,000
Deletions from Title III and insertions under Title II (H. Doc. 91-50).....	12,635,000		16,500,000
Total.....	220,258,407	4,000	24,647,000

The decrease requested in Title III includes a reduction of \$128,000 in amounts requested for increased pay costs of the Bureau of the Budget.

Of the \$220,386,407 increase in the budget authority requested for the Executive branch, \$172,600,000 is for mandatory payments by the Veterans Administration for compensation, pension and educational benefits. These increases result from unexpected rises in the number of eligible claimants and the amount of the average payment. Another \$30,353,000 is for rescue work and repair of damage caused by the recent storms in California and floods in the Mid-West and other parts of the Nation. The remaining items include (1) a request of \$7,611,000 for the Veterans Administration to provide for wage board pay increases under the new coordinated Federal Wage System; (2) a request of \$4,634,000 for the consolidation of Department of

Transportation operations which is more than offset by a decrease of \$6,810,000 for fiscal year 1970 estimates for the same purpose transmitted in House Document No. 91-100; and (3) a request of \$2,781,000 for the Department of the Interior to meet costs of education and welfare services for Indians resulting from a larger number of eligible claimants and greater average payments than expected.

Finally, \$228,407 is requested to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States.

The release of \$4,000 from reserves is requested for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for increased pay and related costs.

Other proposals not increasing budget authority, totaling \$24,647,000, include an increase of \$16,500,000 in limitations for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for higher health insurance intermediary costs due to unexpected increases in workloads and unit costs and a transfer of \$8,000,000 between accounts in the Post Office Department to meet unanticipated overtime costs and summer employment costs.

The details of these proposals are included in the attachment to this letter. I have examined these additions and revisions and have determined that they will not cause the limitations established by Public Law 90-364 to be exceeded. I recommend that you transmit them to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Acting Director.

Add the following proposed supplemental appropriations to Title II of House Document No. 91-50:

THE JUDICIARY

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel", fiscal year 1968, \$850,000.

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel", fiscal year 1969, \$850,000.

As provided by statute, proposed supplemental appropriations for the Judiciary are submitted without change.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

In addition to the amount made available in the appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1969, for retirement pay of commissioned officers and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan, \$147,000 shall be available in that appropriation for such expenses.

This proposal would increase the amount available for retirement pay of commissioned officers and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan by \$147,000. The increase is requested because of an unanticipated rise in the number of retirees, and because Public Law 90-207 and changes in 10 U.S.C. 1401c have raised the amount payable to retirees by 3.9 per cent.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control and coastal emergencies", \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation will provide funds for flood emergency preparation, flood fighting and rescue operations, and emergency repair and restoration of flood control works caused by the floods in California and the spring snowmelt floods in the midwest and other parts of the Nation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Administration of territories", \$950,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$950,000 for the purchase and installation of a 3,000-kw electrical generator for American Samoa due to increasing power demand and recent failure of existing generating equipment.

Substitute the following requests for the corresponding requests transmitted in Title II of House Document No. 91-50, as amended in House Document No. 91-94, which are hereby canceled:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations, and research," \$2,242,000, of which \$450,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

As previously transmitted, this proposed supplemental appropriation requested \$300,000 for the repair and replacement of stream-gaging installations in southern and central California destroyed or damaged by the floods of January 11-27, 1969, and \$1,792,000 for increased pay and related costs. An additional \$150,000 is now requested for the repair and replacement of other stream-gaging facilities damaged in the subsequent floods of February 23-24, 1969.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$400,000, to remain available until expended.

This substitution involves an additional \$200,000 for repairs to the embankments of the Soo Line Railroad running through the Des Lacs National Wildlife Refuge in North Dakota, for which the Federal Government is responsible. The rail spur is used to transport wheat to market, and, unless the damage caused by the recent floods is repaired, this service will not be available to farmers in the area.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$1,103,000, to remain available until expended.

This proposed supplemental appropriation would provide \$100,000 for the Washington Channel Parking Study required by Public Law

90-483 of August 13, 1968, as requested in House Document No. 91-50. An additional \$1,003,000 is now requested for the repair of buildings and utilities in National Park Service areas damaged in recent floods, heavy snows, and storms.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$276,600,000, to remain available until expended.

This substitution involves \$97,600,000 in addition to the amount requested in House Document No. 91-50. The amended supplemental appropriation would provide (1) \$167,136,000 for increased rates of compensation to disabled veterans under Public Law 90-493 of August 19, 1968, and for unanticipated increases arising from Vietnam era caseload and other uncontrollable factors; (2) \$106,664,000 for an increase in the income limitation and higher pension rates under Public Law 90-275 of March 28, 1968, together with increased costs associated with unexpected shifts in pension caseloads; and (3) \$2,800,000 to implement the part-time vocational rehabilitation training authorized by Public Law 90-431 of July 26, 1968.

This appropriation was apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. These actions were reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 19, 1968, and March 20, 1969.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", \$89,200,000, to remain available until expended.

This substitution involves \$75,000,000 in addition to the amount requested in House Document No. 91-50. The amended supplemental appropriation would provide \$89,200,000 to meet the costs of expanded and liberalized educational benefits under Public Law 90-631 of October 23, 1968, and to meet costs of unexpected increases in trainee caseloads and unit costs of training.

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$53,800,000: *(and release of \$15,167,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).*

This substitution involves \$7,611,000 of budget authority in addition to the amount requested in House Document No. 91-50. The amended supplemental appropriation would provide \$14,794,000 to meet increased costs due to unanticipated workload increases, and the increase of travel, postal, and *per diem* rates pursuant to administrative action and Public Laws 90-429 and 90-432 of July 26, 1968. It would also provide \$31,395,000 of budget authority and \$8,167,000 from released reserves for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206. Finally, it would provide \$7,611,000 of budget authority and \$7,000,000 from released reserves for wageboard pay increases under the new Coordinated Federal Wage System.

This appropriation was apportioned, and subsequently reapportioned, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended

(31 U.S.C. 665), on a basis which indicated a necessity for a supplemental appropriation. These actions were reported to the Congress by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on November 19, 1968, and March 26, 1969.

Add the following proposed supplemental appropriation to Title III of House Document No. 91-50:

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Federal Home Loan Bank Board: "Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation", (Release of \$4,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This proposed release of reserves is based on the most recent estimate of reserves which are required to be established by section 201 of Public Law 90-364 but which are needed to meet the cost of pay increases.

Substitute the following requests for the corresponding requests transmitted in Title III of House Document No. 91-50, which are hereby canceled:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Bureau of the Budget: "Salaries and expenses", \$50,000; (and release of \$355,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

This substitution, involving a reduction of \$128,000 in budget authority from the previous request, is possible because the employment limitation provision of Public Law 90-364 is resulting in less average employment than originally forecast.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(OUT OF POSTAL FUND)

"Administration and regional operation"; (Release of \$2,107,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Research, development, and engineering", \$500,000;

"Operations", \$257,071,000, of which \$62,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Transportation".

These substitutions cancel the requests of \$3,304,000 in budget authority for the Administration and regional operations account and \$467,000 in budget authority for the Supplies and services account transmitted in House Document No. 91-50. These decreases are offset by the present request for an additional \$3,771,000 in budget authority in the Operations account. In addition, a transfer of \$8,000,000 is proposed to the Operations account.

Additional overtime costs due to bad winter weather conditions and increased personnel costs in the summer employment program make these shifts of funds necessary.

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: "Salaries and expenses", \$41,000;

This revised request, involving an increase of \$9,000 in budget authority, represents increased costs for executive pay.

Delete the requests for the following appropriations under Title III of House Document No. 91-50, and insert the following proposed supplemental appropriations in Title II of the same document:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

FLOOD PREVENTION

For an additional amount for "Flood prevention", \$4,224,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall remain available until expended for emergency measures for runoff retardation and soil erosion prevention, as provided by section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (33 U.S.C. 701 b-1): (and release of \$128,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

This proposed supplemental appropriation includes \$224,000 in budget authority and \$128,000 in released reserves for increased pay and related costs as requested on January 17, 1969 (H. Doc. No. 91-50). An additional \$4,000,000 is now requested to fund work to prevent further damage from flooding and soil erosion in parts of California and Nevada, and potentially in areas of the West and Northwest.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", \$34,647,000, to be expended, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

As previously submitted, this proposed supplemental requested an increase of limitation of \$18,147,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206. An additional increase of \$16,500,000 in the limitation is now requested for higher health insurance intermediary costs due to increase of workloads and higher unit costs.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Education and welfare services", \$5,624,000: (and release of \$415,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

This revised request would provide an additional \$2,781,000 for unanticipated increases in the average monthly caseload and the size of payment per person in the general assistance and child welfare programs.

BUREAU OF MINES

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Health and safety", \$750,000, and, in addition, \$347,000 which shall be derived by transfer from "Solid waste disposal".

This revision involves an additional \$750,000 for the improvement of the Federal health and safety program for coal miners, including the accelerated hiring and training of coal and metal mine inspectors, acceleration of research on dust production and control, and the upgrading of the training of mine inspectors.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$5,079,000, of which \$4,634,000, shall remain available until June 30, 1971, for necessary expenses in connection with the consolidation of Departmental activities into the Southwest Area of Washington, D.C.

As previously submitted, this proposed supplemental appropriation requested \$445,000 for increased pay costs. An additional \$4,634,000 is now requested for the consolidation of various headquarter activities of the Department of Transportation in one location in Southwest Washington, D.C. The amount is more than offset by the elimination of a request for the same purpose included in the 1970 budget.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

U.S. SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,808,000.

This substitution involves an additional \$470,000 for anticipated costs arising from unforeseen travel in connection with various protective missions and security assignments, reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees reassigned to permanent protective details as authorized by Public Law 89-516, and for leasing multi-purpose rooms (security rooms, temporary command posts and rooms in the immediate vicinity of the principals protected) for protective duties. The request also includes \$1,338,000 for increased pay costs under Public Laws 90-206 and 90-320, which was submitted earlier in House Document No. 91-50.

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered —, Ninety-first Congress, \$228,407, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: Provided, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: Provided further, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

DAMAGE CLAIMS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. 20310, November 21, 1968.

HON. CHARLES J. ZWICK,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C. 20503

DEAR MR. ZWICK: The Department of the Army has considered and found meritorious in an amount exceeding \$15,000 the claim of Mrs. Pierrette Pirin Riberolles, 16, Rue Grande Fontaine, Cournon d' Auvergne 63 (Puy de Dome), France. This action was taken pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. section 2734 which authorizes the settlement of claims for property loss or damage, or personal injury or death, suffered in a foreign country by an inhabitant thereof, when caused by civilian employees or military personnel, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities, of one of the military departments of the United States.

A brief statement of the character of the claim, the amount claimed, and the amount allowed follows:

The claim of Mrs. Pierrette Pirin Riberolles, widow of Henri Rene Riberolles, for herself and on behalf of her minor son, Vincent Riberolles, and her minor daughter, Anne Riberolles, is in the total amount of 407,846.18 French francs (approximately \$83,233.91) for damages suffered because of the death of Mr. Riberolles as the result of a traffic incident which occurred on September 6, 1963, in France. Mr. Riberolles was operating his automobile on a highway between Versailles and St. Germain en Laye, proceeding in a northerly direction. A United States Army vehicle operated by a member of the United States Army, not acting within the scope of his employment, travelling in the same direction at a high rate of speed, struck the vehicle operated by Mr. Riberolles. Both vehicles were

damaged beyond repair. Mr. Riberolles was fatally injured, as was the operator of the military vehicle and one of his passengers.

The claim was presented within the time prescribed by the statute. It is deemed meritorious and the sum of 147,477.20 French francs (approximately \$30,097.39) has been found to be just and reasonable. This sum has been apportioned in the following manner:

A. To Mrs. Pierrette Pirin Riberolles, widow of Henri Rene Riberolles, individually, 102,643.04 francs (approximately \$20,947.56).

B. To the duly appointed legal guardian of Vincent and Anne Riberolles, minor son and daughter of Henri Rene Riberolles, 44,834.16 francs (approximately \$9,149.83), which represents 22,758.92 francs apportioned to Vincent Riberolles and 22,075.24 francs to Anne Riberolles.

The guardian of the minor children and Mrs. Riberolles, individually, have agreed to accept the amounts apportioned to them in full satisfaction and final settlement of the claim.

In accordance with the provisions of the cited statute, the claim is certified to Congress as a legal claim in the amount found just and reasonable for payment out of any appropriation that may be made by Congress therefor. It is recommended that necessary funds be appropriated to effect payment of the sum of 147,477.20 French francs, apportioned as set forth above.

Amount claimed, 407,846.18 French francs (approximately \$83,233.91); amount reported, 147,477.20 French francs (approximately \$30,097.39).

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES W. HAYWARD,
Colonel, GS Executive.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C. 20310, April 17, 1969.

HON. ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C. 20503

DEAR MR. MAYO: The Department of the Army has considered, ascertained, adjusted, and determined, in an amount in excess of \$5,000, the claim hereinafter described which concerns property damage. The settlement of the claim is in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 2733. The Act provides for settlement of claims for damage to property caused by the activities of a member of the United States Army while engaged in a noncombat activity.

A brief statement of the amount claimed, the nature of the claim, and the amount reported follows:

Anschutz Land Company, Ltd., a limited partnership, Denver, Colo., represented by Ray, Quinney, and Nebeker, attorneys at law, suite 400, Deseret Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84111, has filed a claim for \$607,500 for diminution of value of its land. The claim of Anschutz Land and Livestock Company, Inc., for \$431,951.68, as amended, for the loss of 6,249 sheep arising out of the same incident was previously approved by the Secretary of the Army in the amount of \$376,685; \$5,000 being paid by the Department of the Army and the balance being appropriated by Congress.

On March 13, 1968, a persistent chemical nerve agent was sprayed from a high-performance aircraft during a test conducted at Dugway Proving Ground, Utah. The next day sheep on the claimant's ranch at White Rock, approximately 27 miles east of the test site, began dying. On March 15, a large number of sheep started dying in another herd farther to the east in Skull Valley. In all, sheep at three separate locations on the ranch were affected. Based on numerous tests conducted by various Government agencies, it was concluded that the chemical compound found in the snow, water, and grass and in the blood, liver, and stomach contents of the dead sheep was related to nerve agent samples provided by Dugway Proving Ground. It was also concluded that some of the nerve agent tested

at Dugway Proving Ground on March 13, 1968, was deposited on the claimant's land in Skull Valley. As a result of this, the claimant was precluded from utilizing the affected locations, which constituted a substantial portion of its Skull Valley ranch, until October 17, 1968, when it was notified the land was again usable. At that date, the claimant was unable to purchase replacement sheep for the 1968-1969 grazing season.

It has been determined that the claim is payable in the amount of \$198,309.30. This amount is based on the amount of prospective net revenue lost by the claimant as a result of not being able to utilize all of its land in Skull Valley the summer and fall of 1968 and the winter of 1968-1969 as a result of the incident. The claimant has agreed to accept this amount as outlined in the attached settlement agreement. The full amount due the claimant has been determined to be reportable to the Congress for its consideration. It is recommended that this amount be submitted to the Congress for an appropriation of payment.

The payment of this claim, together with that previously made to Anschutz Land and Livestock Company, Inc., will settle in full all claims of the Anschutz interests arising out of the March 13, 1968, incident. No further claims are pending out of the Skull Valley incident.

The amount claimed, \$607,500; amount paid, none; amount reported, \$198,309.30.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE M. BECKER,
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management).

○

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 16, 1969
For actions of May 15, 1969
91st-1st No. 79

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....10	Foreign trade.....33,29	Poverty.....7
Appropriation.....32	Forest products.....13	Reclamation.....30
Assistant Secretary.....28	Hunger.....15	Recreation.....23
Beekeepers.....25	Indemnity payments.....25	Research.....2,22
Budget.....16	Information.....24	Shipping.....12
Census.....14	Item veto.....32	Sugar.....5
Civil works.....28	Job Corps.....3,17	Supplemental
Conservation.....11	Land.....21	appropriations.....1
Dairy imports.....29	Legislative program.....9	Taxation.....8,20
Ethics.....24	National issues.....6	Textile.....33
Employment.....26	National parks.....23	Water resources.....31
Farm program.....27	Nutrition.....15	Weather.....22
Fees and charges.....23	Personnel.....19	Wildlife.....21
Flood control.....4	Pollution.....18	

HIGHLIGHTS: House Appropriations Committee reported second supplemental appropriation bill. Rep. Patman expressed concern over "rural poverty." Rep. Leggett criticized proposed closing of Job Corps Centers.

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969 (H. Rept. 91-252) (p. H3752). At the end of this Digest is a table reflecting the Committee action on items for this Department. The bill includes the following provision:

"Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: Provided, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

"The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter."

2. RESEARCH. The Science and Astronautics Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11271, NASA authorization for fiscal year 1970. p. D395.
A subcommittee of the Science and Astronautics Committee approved for full committee action H. J. Res. 589, urging support of the Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program, H. R. 35, amended, to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities of the U. S., and H. R. 4284, to authorize appropriations to carry out the Standard Reference Data Act. p. D395.
3. JOB CORPS. Rep. Leggett criticized the "decision...to close 50 Job Corps Conservation centers" and inserted supporting articles. pp. H3706-11.
4. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Andrews, N. Dak., commended "Operation Foresight," the President's flood preparedness program initiated last February. pp. H3713-15.
5. SUGAR. Received from the Florida Legislature a memorial relative to amending the Sugar Act to allow the mainland cane sugar area to fill a portion of the unused Puerto Rico quota. p. H3754.
6. NATIONAL ISSUES. Rep. Monagan inserted an editorial he submitted for publication, "The National Issues" including items of interest to this Department. p. H3745.

24. INFORMATION; ETHICS. H. R. 11369 by Rep. MacGregor, to require quarterly disclosure to the Comptroller General of the United States of the sources and amount of all outside income received by any person serving as a Federal judge, a Member of Congress, or a policymaking official in the executive branch of the Government; to Judiciary Committee.
H. R. 11370 by Rep. MacGregor, to make it a Federal crime for anyone to pay, or to offer to pay, and for any Federal judge, Member of Congress, or policymaking official in the executive branch of the Government to receive, any sum greater than \$500 for a speech, published work, professional service, personal appearance, or otherwise by the honorarium; to Judiciary Committee.
H. R. 11380 by Rep. Ruppe same as above with remarks of author pp. H3727-30.
25. BEEKEEPER. H. R. 11333 by Rep. Pettis, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to certain beekeepers; to Agriculture Committee.
26. EMPLOYMENT. H. R. 11340 by Rep. Pollock, to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to Public Works Committee.
27. FARM PROGRAM. H. R. 11355 by Rep. Clark, to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers; to Agriculture Committee.
28. ASSISTANT SECRETARY. H. R. 11356 by Rep. Clausen, to amend title 10 of the U.S.C., to provide for an Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author pp. H3712.
29. DAIRY IMPORTS. H. R. 11359 by Rep. Duncan, to regulate imports of milk and dairy products; to Ways and Means Committee.
30. RECLAMATION. H. R. 11368 by Rep. McFall, to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
31. WATER RESOURCES. H. R. 11378 by Rep. Reifel, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource development proposals; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
resolution proposing an amendment
32. ITEM VETO. H. J. Res. 722 by Rep. Halpern, to the Constitution of the U.S. relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills; to Judiciary Committee.
33. TEXTILE; FOREIGN TRADE. H. Res. 408 by Rep. Dorn, to commend Secretary Maurice Stans; to Ways and Means Committee. Remarks of author p. H3696.

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS:

- May 16: Second supplemental appropriations, S. Appropriations.
Farmworker collective bargaining, S. Labor and Public Welfare.
Hold certain lands in trust for Pueblo Indians, H. Interior.
- May 28: Establish Sawtooth National Recreation Area, Idaho, S. Interior
(Cliff, FS, to testify).

	Budget Estimate a/	House Committee Action a/	House Committee Bill Compared with Budget Estimate
Agricultural Research Service:			
Salaries and Expenses - Screwworm eradication program	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	- -
Extension Service:			
Cooperative Extension Work, Payments and Expenses - Retirement and employees' compensation costs	218,000	218,000	- -
Agricultural Stabilization and Conser- vation Service:			
Sugar Act program	7,500,000	7,500,000	- -
Farmers Home Administration:			
Emergency Credit Revolving Fund ...	- -	25,000,000 b/	+\$25,000,000
Forest Service:			
Forest Protection and Utilization:			
Fighting forest fires	21,000,000	21,000,000	- -
Timber sales	460,000	460,000	- -
Pay costs	<u>35,809,000</u>	<u>35,262,000</u>	<u>-547,000</u>
Total, Department of Agriculture	<u>66,387,000</u>	<u>90,840,000</u>	<u>+24,453,000</u>

a/ To be provided by supplemental appropriation, release of P.L. 90-364 reserves or by transfer among funds within the Department.

b/ Authorizes advance from the Farmers Home Administration Direct Loan Account.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

MAY 15, 1969.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11400]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The bill is divided into five titles:

- I—Military operations in Southeast Asia,
- II—General supplementals (various),
- III—Increased pay costs,
- IV—Ceiling on 1970 expenditures, and
- V—General provisions.

The grand total of new budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill is \$3,783,212,766, a reduction of about 13%, or \$580,794,190, from the revised budget requests of \$4,364,006,956 considered.

In addition, under title II there are proposed increases of \$82,500,000 in limitations on annual contract authorizations involving interest subsidies for homeownership and rental housing assistance and college housing. The budget requests for these total \$104,500,000, so there is a reduction of \$22,000,000. Also, numerous provisions in the bill would release \$82,766,000 held in reserve under the cutback provisions of Public Law 90-364.

The amounts in the bill are within the overall totals of budget authority for 1969 shown in the administration's budget review released April 15th. That is, they are well within the totals contemplated in that review. And they are also well below the supplemental provisions contemplated for fiscal 1969 in the budget last January.

The January budget projected fiscal 1969 budget authority supplementals of \$4,813,000,000, inclusive of \$198,000,000 dependent on legislation which is not yet enacted. Of the remainder (\$4,615,000,000), a total of \$4,365,000,000 in new budget authority was submitted to the House and considered in connection with the accompanying bill. An additional \$221,000,000 in new budget authority requests for 1969—finalized after House Committee hearings were closed out—was submitted to the Senate (S. Doc. 91-18) for consideration in connection with this bill. Thus the total of such budget authority requests now indicated is \$4,586,000,000, or, in round figures, \$29,000,000 below the \$4,615,000,000 mentioned above.

This is the way the total picture stands on 1969 supplementals as of this date. It is a net result; the new administration reviewed and revised many of the supplemental requests submitted by the previous administration and made a number of reductions. But as the totals now stand, increases submitted have offset all but \$29,000,000 of the decreases from the January budget that were projected on April 15 (again, not counting the \$198,000,000 that hinges on legislation).

SUMMARY BY TITLES

Title I, Defense military, includes \$1,234,000,000 for military operations in Southeast Asia. This compares with the revised request of \$1,496,900,000, a reduction of \$262,900,000, or about 17 percent. The explanation begins on page 11.

Title II, for sundry general supplementals, includes \$1,365,914,312, a reduction of \$39,736,850, or just under 3% from the budget requests of \$1,405,651,162 in new budget (obligational) authority. Some releases of reserves and other non-add provisions are involved. Increases of \$82,500,000—a reduction of \$22,000,000 from the request—are also proposed in limitations on annual contract authorizations in certain interest subsidy programs in the housing field.

The details are set forth under the various chapters in the report, but the great bulk of title II relates to items not subject to effective discretionary control in the annual bills. Some 83%, or \$1,132,000,000, of the total, for example, is involved in grants to states for public assistance; veterans compensation, medical, and other costs; unemployment compensation payments; military retired pay; and disaster relief.

Title III, for increased pay costs, includes \$1,183,298,454 in new budget (obligational) authority, an overall reduction of \$278,157,340, or about 19 percent from the revised budget requests of \$1,461,455,794. Release of \$62,277,000 of P. L. 90-364 reserves is also involved, plus numerous transfers between appropriations to enable greater absorption of pay costs.

These supplementals relate to unabsorbed portions of pay raises generally effective last July 1 that were not taken into account in the regular 1969 appropriations. A resume with more details is on page 73 of this report.

Title IV, limitation on 1970 budget outlays, proposes an overall ceiling on expenditures of the government during the fiscal year 1970 that begins on July 1, 1969. The proposal is explained in considerable detail beginning on page 118 of this report.

Title V, general provisions, contains general provisions customarily carried.

APPROXIMATE EFFECT ON 1969 EXPENDITURES (BUDGET OUTLAYS)

It is the committee's tentative estimate that the reduction of \$580,794,190 in new budget (obligational) authority requests, plus the relatively minor changes in requested transfers between appropriations, and reserve releases, will translate into a reduction of approximately \$464,000,000 in budget outlays previously projected *for fiscal year 1969*, by titles of the bill roughly as follows: title I, \$165,000,000; title II, \$26,000,000; and title III, \$273,000,000. The reductions in the interest subsidy contract authorizations limitations would not affect projected 1969 outlays.

The outlay effect of the remainder of the reduction in new budget authority and interest subsidy contract authorization limitations would be of some consideration in determining the impact of congressional actions on fiscal 1970 budget outlays; perhaps to a minor extent, even on fiscal 1971 outlays.

TABULAR SUMMARY

The following table summarizes the revised budget requests and the amounts in the bill by titles and chapters. The estimates on which it is based will be found in H. Docs. 91-15; 50; 85; 94; 98; 99; and 101:

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

SUMMARY

Report page No.	Chapter No.		Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
11		TITLE I Military operations in Southeast Asia: New budget (obligational) authority-----	\$1, 496, 900, 000	\$1, 234, 000, 000	—\$262, 900, 000
16	I	TITLE II Agriculture: New budget (obligational) authority-----	9, 118, 000	9, 118, 000	-----
19	II	Defense: New budget (obligational) authority-----	249, 682, 000	226, 050, 000	—23, 632, 000
24	III	District of Columbia: Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority----- <i>District of Columbia funds:</i> <i>New budget (obligational) authority</i> -----	11, 000, 000 (25, 871, 000)	10, 365, 000 (25, 553, 000)	—635, 000 (—518, 000)
27	IV	Foreign operations: New budget (obligational) authority----- <i>By transfer</i> -----	2, 853, 000 (38, 000)	2, 700, 000 (35, 000)	—153, 000 (—3, 000)

Independent offices—Housing and Urban Development:

New budget (obligational) authority:

1968-----	7, 168, 000	7, 168, 000	-----
1969-----	314, 291, 000	306, 062, 000	- 8, 229, 000
Total-----	321, 459, 000	313, 230, 000	- 8, 229, 000
<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.</i>	<i>(104, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(82, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(- 22, 000, 000)</i>
<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	<i>(15, 248, 000)</i>	<i>(15, 248, 000)</i>	-----

Interior:

New budget (obligational) authority-----	59, 302, 000	54, 227, 000	- 5, 075, 000
<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	<i>(2, 886, 000)</i>	<i>(2, 886, 000)</i>	-----
<i>By transfer</i> -----	<i>(1, 628, 000)</i>	<i>(1, 628, 000)</i>	-----
<i>Liquidation cash</i> -----	<i>(19, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(19, 000, 000)</i>	-----

Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare:

New budget (obligational) authority-----	713, 707, 000	713, 707, 000	-----
<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	<i>(292, 000)</i>	<i>(292, 000)</i>	-----
<i>By transfer</i> -----	<i>(9, 346, 000)</i>	<i>(9, 346, 000)</i>	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

SUMMARY—Continued

Report page No.	Chapter No.		Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
		TITLE II—Continued			
52	VIII	Legislative branch.....		\$30, 000	+\$30, 000
55	IX	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary: New budget (obligational) authority:			
		1968.....	\$10, 000	10, 000	
		1969.....	16, 756, 350	15, 013, 500	—1, 742, 850
		Total.....	16, 766, 350	15, 023, 500	—1, 742, 850
		Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves.....	(1, 701, 000)	(1, 701, 000)	
		By transfer.....	(220, 000)	(220, 000)	
66	X	Transportation: New budget (obligational) authority.....	2, 598, 000	2, 298, 000	—300, 000
		Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves.....	(28, 000)	(28, 000)	

68	XI	Treasury-Post Office:			
		New budget (obligational) authority-----	2, 285, 000	2, 285, 000	-----
		Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(334, 000)	(334, 000)	-----
71	XII	Claims and judgments-----	16, 880, 812	16, 880, 812	-----
		Total, title II:			-----
		New budget (obligational) authority:			
		1968-----	7, 178, 000	7, 178, 000	-----
		1969-----	1, 398, 473, 162	1, 358, 736, 312	-39, 736, 850
		Total-----	1, 405, 651, 162	1, 365, 914, 312	-39, 736, 850
		New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations-----	(104, 500, 000)	(82, 500, 000)	(-22, 000, 000)
		Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(20, 489, 000)	(20, 489, 000)	-----
		By transfer-----	(11, 232, 000)	(11, 229, 000)	(-3, 000)
		Liquidation cash-----	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	-----
		Increased pay costs (included above):			
		Budget authority-----	(127, 767, 400)	(116, 435, 400)	(-11, 332, 000)
		Release of reserves-----	(18, 589, 000)	(18, 589, 000)	-----
		By transfer-----	(1, 386, 000)	(1, 383, 000)	(-3, 000)
		Total-----	(147, 742, 400)	(136, 407, 400)	(-11, 335, 000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
SUMMARY—Continued

Report page No.	Chapter No.		Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
73		TITLE III			
		INCREASED PAY COSTS			
		New budget (obligational) authority-----	\$1, 461, 455, 794	\$1, 183, 298, 454	—\$278, 157, 340
		Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves-----	(61, 974, 000)	(62, 277, 000)	(+ 303, 000)
		By transfer-----	(75, 233, 000)	(81, 676, 000)	(+ 6, 443, 000)
		Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses--	(24, 395, 000)	(22, 223, 000)	(- 2, 172, 000)
		TITLE V			
		GENERAL PROVISIONS			
		Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for per- sonal services pursuant to section 502 of bill (H. Doc. 91-50) --	(630, 000)	(630, 000)	-----

RECAPITULATION

Grand total, titles I, II, III, and V:

New budget (obligational) authority:

1968-----

7, 178, 000

7, 178, 000

1969-----

4, 356, 828, 956

3, 776, 034, 766

--580, 794, 190

Total-----

4, 364, 006, 956

3, 783, 212, 766

--580, 794, 190

New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations--

(104, 500, 000)

(82, 500, 000)

Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----

(82, 463, 000)

(82, 766, 000)

By transfer-----

(86, 465, 000)

(92, 905, 000)

Liquidation cash-----

(19, 000, 000)

(19, 000, 000)

Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses-----

(24, 395, 000)

(22, 223, 000)

(-2, 172, 000)

Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to section 502 of bill-----

(630, 000)

(630, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

SUMMARY—Continued

Report page No.	Chapter No.		Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
		RECAPITULATION—Continued			
		Grand total, titles I, II, III, V—Continued			
		<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
		<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(\$1, 589, 223, 194)	(\$1, 299, 733, 854)	(—\$289, 489, 340)
		<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(80, 563, 000)	(80, 866, 000)	(+303, 000)
		<i>By transfer</i> -----	(76, 619, 000)	(83, 059, 000)	(+6, 440, 000)
		<i>Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(24, 395, 000)	(22, 223, 000)	(—2, 172, 000)
		<i>Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to section 502 of bill</i> -----	(630, 000)	(630, 000)	-----
		Total-----	(1, 771, 430, 194)	(1, 486, 511, 854)	(—284, 918, 340)

TITLE I

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GEORGE H. MAHON, TEXAS, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, FLORIDA	GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, MISSISSIPPI	CALIFORNIA
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, ALABAMA	WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, OHIO
DANIEL J. FLOOD, PENNSYLVANIA	JOHN J. RHODES, ARIZONA
JOHN M. SLACK, WEST VIRGINIA	GLENN R. DAVIS, WISCONSIN
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, NEW YORK	

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

The Committee considered amended estimates totalling \$1,496,900,000 as requested in House Document No. 91-94 for military operations in Southeast Asia. The original supplemental estimates for this effort had been \$1,631,500,000, as requested in House Document No. 91-50. The Committee recommends appropriations totalling \$1,234,000,000 which will be used generally for the following purposes:

<i>Purpose</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Military pay cost for additional personnel-----	\$239, 500, 000
Operational support, and maintenance of equipment-----	354, 400, 000
Procurement of additional equipment-----	640, 100, 000
Total-----	1, 234, 000, 000

NEED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL

Subsequent to the preparation of the Department of Defense fiscal year 1969 budget estimates and their presentation to the Congress, two significant events took place which had not been contemplated in preparing those estimates. First, in January 1968, the enemy Tet offensive required the deployment of additional forces to Vietnam to strengthen U.S. and Allied forces already deployed. Such an action, of course, required increasing support operations including (1) the purchase and shipment of additional materials and supplies, (2) the maintenance and overhaul of additional equipment and (3) other general increases required by additional troop deployments. Also, the Tet offensive caused considerable damage to materiel and equipment which had to be either repaired or replaced. The losses sustained were much greater than anticipated as routine replacements in preparing the budget estimates.

Secondly, the seizure of the PUEBLO by the North Koreans shortly after the Tet offensive resulted in the call-up of Reserve forces to meet the possible military threat from North Korea and to generally strengthen our military posture. Certain improvements were required and additional troops and equipment were deployed.

In an effort to make abundantly clear that the Congress desired to provide whatever funds might be required for the conduct of military operations in Southeast Asia, Congress specifically exempted the costs of operations in Southeast Asia from provisions of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 otherwise limiting obligations and expenditures. Language in the Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1969 made yet another exemption for certain civilian employees.

The Department of Defense was, of course, constrained by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 in areas of operations other than those directly related to Southeast Asia. For a detailed description of the determination of costs and approach to the budget see pages 448-457 of the Hearings on the Second Supplemental, 1969.

The President's budget for fiscal year 1969 had proposed Defense expenditures in the amount of \$25.8 billion for special support of Vietnam operations. As has been stated in testimony before the Committee and in debate on the Floor of the House, there are not separate sets of accounts for the conduct of war operations in Vietnam. The amounts set forth in the President's budget and in testimony before the Appropriations Committee are the best available statistical approximation of the cost of the war in Vietnam.

As a result of military actions, and the exemption available, estimates for special support of military operations in Southeast Asia now total \$27.5 billion in obligational authority and \$28.8 billion in expenditures. These amounts include the estimates submitted in connection with the pending bill. As a result of the recommendations of the Committee in reducing obligational authority from \$1.5 billion to \$1.2 billion, it is probable that expenditures related to Southeast Asia in fiscal year 1969 will be reduced by approximately \$165 million.

VALIDITY OF ESTIMATES

Although the Committee recognizes the need for additional funds for Southeast Asia operations, considerable time was devoted to analyzing the request to assure that only those funds are recommended which are actually required. In this review, several areas were noted where, in the opinion of the Committee, stated requirements appeared to be in excess of current need. All such items were deleted. The Committee is of the firm opinion that, though every valid requirement in support of our effort (and that of our Allies) in Southeast Asia should be honored, a supplemental request should not provide for unessential items or items not related to Southeast Asia. The specific reasons for the various reductions are discussed below under the appropriation item for which funds are requested.

The Committee believes that the funds provided in this Title of the bill will be sufficient to meet the requirements as presented by the Department of Defense. In the opinion of the Committee all the funds being recommended are necessary and should be appropriated.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Committee reduced these items by \$64,200,000 from requests totalling \$303,700,000 to recommended amounts totalling \$239,500,000 as shown in detail on the table appearing on page 15. The reductions recommended generally represent the deletion of items not directly related to Southeast Asia operations such as winter underwear, enlisted women's clothing, subdued insignia, change of station travel, and the cost of shipment of household effects. In addition, a reduction was made on the basis of estimated overfunding generally included in Military Personnel requests as evidenced by the overstatement of man-year requirements and the costs associated with operational rations and subsistence and other allowances.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The amended requests for operation and maintenance accounts amount to \$476,200,000. The Committee recommends appropriations of \$354,400,000, a reduction of \$121,800,000. The Committee's action on each of the amounts requested is shown in the table on page 15.

The principal reason for this large reduction was the apparent overstatement of requirements for the purchase of supplies, spare parts, and associated transportation cost. In addition, the Committee believes that the funds requested were greatly in excess of need for the repair, overhaul, modification, and conversion of equipment and aircraft. Funds for the rental of additional Automatic Data Processing Equipment are denied on the basis that the request did not appear to be required or germane to the intent of the supplemental.;

PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES, ARMY

The Committee recommends the supplemental appropriation of \$640,100,000 for this account. The sum recommended is \$76,900,000 less than the request of \$717,000,000.

The \$62,200,000 requested under "Aircraft" and "Aircraft Spares and Repair Parts" is denied since the required authorizing legislation has not been enacted. The request did not include any new aircraft. The funds requested were for modifications and spare parts.

The \$3,300,000 requested for quick erectable antennas is denied since engineering tests have revealed deficiencies in this item which have not yet been corrected.

A reduction of \$11,400,000 is recommended in the \$31,700,000 requested for "Production Base Support". The Army is requesting the initiation of a substantial multi-year modernization of ammunition plants in fiscal 1970. The Committee wants to review the whole requirement in this area before the appropriation of additional large sums.

SUMMARY OF DEFENSE FUNDS IN BILL

Funds were requested for Department of Defense activities in each of the three titles of the accompanying bill. The following table summarizes the estimates and recommendations.

Title of bill	Estimate, H. Doc. 91-50	Revised estimate, H. Doc. 91-94	Recommended in bill	Bill compared to revised estimate
Title I Military Operations In Southeast Asia.....	\$1,631,500,000	\$1,496,900,000	\$1,234,000,000	—\$262,900,000
Title II Other Proposed Supplemental Appropriations.....	252,782,000	249,682,000	226,050,000	—23,632,000
Title III Increased Pay Costs.....	1,127,618,000	1,124,618,000	852,018,000	—272,600,000
Total, Defense.....	3,011,900,000	2,871,200,000	2,312,068,000	—559,132,000

For purposes of comparison with the regular annual appropriations for 1969, the following summary table may be useful.

Title of regular annual bill	Regular annual act appropriated	Supplemental appropriations recommended	Total to be available
PUBLIC LAW 90-580			
Title I—Military personnel.....	\$22,571,600,000	\$1,085,150,000	\$23,656,750,000
Title II—Operation and maintenance.....	21,765,000,000	586,818,000	22,351,818,000
Title III—Procurement.....	19,981,900,000	640,100,000	20,622,000,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	7,551,328,000	-----	7,551,328,000
Total.....	71,869,828,000	2,312,068,000	74,181,896,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY			
	MILITARY PERSONNEL			
91-94	Military personnel, Army-----	\$136,200,000	\$110,000,000	-\$26,200,000
91-94	Military personnel, Navy-----	21,500,000	14,500,000	-7,000,000
91-94	Military personnel, Air Force-----	146,000,000	115,000,000	-31,000,000
	Total, military personnel-----	303,700,000	239,500,000	-64,200,000
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
91-94	Operation and maintenance, Army-----	144,600,000	96,310,000	-48,290,000
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps-----	24,300,000	15,390,000	-8,910,000
91-94	Operation and maintenance, Air Force-----	307,300,000	242,700,000	-64,600,000
	Total, operation and maintenance-----	476,200,000	354,400,000	-121,800,000
	PROCUREMENT			
91-94	Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army-----	717,000,000	640,100,000	-76,900,000
	Total, title I, Military operations in Southeast Asia, Department of Defense, military-----	1,496,900,000	1,234,000,000	-262,900,000

TITLE II

CHAPTER I

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, MISSISSIPPI, *Chairman*

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, KENTUCKY

ODIN LANGEN, MINNESOTA

W. R. HULL, JR., MISSOURI

ROBERT H. MICHEL, ILLINOIS

GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, ILLINOIS

JACK EDWARDS, ALABAMA

FRANK E. EVANS, COLORADO

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends the full budget request of \$1,400,000 to combat a serious outbreak of screwworms in the southwestern part of the United States which could not be foreseen when the regular 1969 appropriation bill was enacted.

Weather conditions have been unusually favorable for the increase in screwworm populations since Hurricane Beulah in the fall of 1967. To meet a serious buildup of infestation last fall, it became necessary to increase production of sterile flies for control purposes beyond the level expected. Under authority of Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), screwworm funds were apportioned by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget on a deficiency basis, and they have been obligated at a rate which will exhaust them by mid-May.

The proposed supplemental will permit continued production of sterile flies at a level of about 150 million flies per week, the minimum number considered necessary to meet this threat and to maintain a barrier zone against further infestation from Mexico. It is expected that Federal funds will be matched by State and local funds for eradication of sporadic outbreaks north of the barrier.

EXTENSION SERVICE

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES

The full budget estimate of \$218,000 is proposed to meet the mandatory Federal contribution to the retirement fund for State extension personnel. These payments are related to increased funds provided by Congress in the regular 1969 appropriation bill to place extension agents on a salary basis more comparable with other agricultural personnel.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

A supplemental appropriation of \$7,500,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1969 to complete payments on the 1968 crop. These payments are mandatory to producers who comply with the requirements of the Sugar Act. The additional amount is due primarily to increased beet sugar production resulting from better-than-average yields and larger sugarbeet plantings than originally contemplated. Current forecasts indicate a total increase in 1968 sugar production of some 716,000 short tons.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

The Emergency Credit Revolving Fund is faced with a serious shortage of funds in the next 5 or 6 months. Recent floods, heavy snows, and other natural disasters throughout the country have created an immediate demand for around \$10,000,000 of emergency farm credit which cannot be met with funds available to the Department through next June 30. In addition, it now appears likely that the additional emergency credit demands during the early part of the next fiscal year will exceed estimated collections from loan repayments by \$15,000,000 or more.

To meet this indicated deficit in emergency loan funds and enable as many farmers as possible who have suffered losses from natural disasters to continue their farming operations during the present crop season, the Committee has included language in the bill to authorize the transfer of \$25,000,000 of unobligated funds from the FHA Direct Loan Account to the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund. The proposed language requires this temporary advance to be repaid in full to the Direct Loan Account from repayments of loans made from the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund.

INCREASED PAY COSTS

Under title III of the bill, the Committee recommends a total of \$28,330,000 for increased pay costs of the Department during fiscal year 1969. Of this amount, \$12,905,000 is provided by supplemental appropriations contained in this bill, \$10,243,000 is provided by the release of P.L. 90-364 reserves, and \$5,182,000 is provided by transfers among funds within the Department.

The amounts proposed, as compared with the budget requests, represent a reduction of \$1,047,000 in appropriated funds and an increase of \$500,000 in releases from P.L. 90-364 reserves. The net decrease of \$547,000 results primarily from personnel cut-backs imposed by section 201 of P.L. 90-364.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER I DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	\$1, 400, 000	\$1, 400, 000	-----
	EXTENSION SERVICE			
91-94	Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses-----	218, 000	218, 000	-----
	AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE			
91-50	Sugar Act program-----	7, 500, 000	7, 500, 000	-----
	FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION			
-----	Emergency credit revolving fund-----	-----	(1)	-----
	Total, chapter I: New budget (obligational) authority-----	9, 118, 000	9, 118, 000	-----

¹ Language authorizing advance of \$25,000,000 from Direct Loan Account, subject to reimbursement from loan repayments.

CHAPTER II

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GEORGE H. MAHON, TEXAS, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, FLORIDA	GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, MISSISSIPPI	CALIFORNIA
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, ALABAMA	WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, OHIO
DANIEL J. FLOOD, PENNSYLVANIA	JOHN J. RHODES, ARIZONA
JOHN M. SLACK, WEST VIRGINIA	GLENN R. DAVIS, WISCONSIN
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, NEW YORK	

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

The Committee recommends appropriations totalling \$226,050,000, a reduction of \$23,632,000 below the revised request of \$249,682,000.

The largest part of the funds requested in this Title (\$175 million) is for Retired Pay, Defense. The requirement for additional funds results from increased benefits paid in accordance with cost of living allowances previously authorized by law. No reductions were made in this request because the funds can only be used for the payment of retirement benefits and will lapse if not utilized by the end of the fiscal year.

The reductions of \$23.6 million were made against the balance of the request (\$74.7 million) on the basis that funds could not be effectively utilized prior to the end of the fiscal year, or that requirements stated were in excess of actual needs of the services involved. The Committee allowed only that portion of the funding which is necessary for the remainder of the fiscal year.

The specific reasons for the various reductions are outlined in the paragraphs which follow.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

As indicated above, no reduction is recommended in the estimate for Retired Pay, Defense. The funds requested for Reserve Personnel, Navy and Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps, appear to be generally overstated. For example, both requested additional funding for increased per diem costs for Reservists in travel status during training cycles. The request was based on the new per diem allowance authorized by Public Law 90-168. However, the Committee noted that the numbers used in computing the requirements appear to be far in excess of the number of personnel that would be in actual travel status and reduced the request proportionately.

A reduction was levied against all requests for funds to meet increased pay costs. Testimony before the Committee disclosed that the supplemental requests for increased pay costs both in Titles II and III were based on the total annual requirements. These requirements had been prepared on the basis of first-quarter obligation rates. Many of the estimates have proven to be overstated when reviewed at this point in time as evidenced by a 5300 man-year reduction made by the Army and a 600 man-year reduction made by the Marine Corps.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

All requests for increased pay costs were reduced for the reasons stated above. Details as to each appropriation item appear in the tables immediately following. In addition, reductions were made in the request for premium pay and employee benefits for National Guard technicians; depot overhaul of Guard equipment and aircraft; and in funds for training and other operational costs.

Included in this Title is a request for a change in the language of the Operation and Maintenance appropriations for the Navy and Marine Corps for fiscal year 1969, which would reduce the floor for the maintenance of real property facilities by \$17 million and \$1.5 million, respectively. The Committee is of the opinion that the minimum amounts specified in the Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1969 should be retained and the request for revision is denied.

GENERAL PROVISION

The Committee recommends the inclusion of Section 201 relating to deficiency authorities provided in Revised Statute 3732 (41 U.S.C. 11) for the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Over the past several years, the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, acting under directions from the Department of Defense, have found it necessary from time to time to exercise this deficiency authority. The Committee is of the opinion that at times this authority has been more generously construed than was intended. However, since it is approaching the end of the fiscal year, rather than to attempt at this point to redefine intent, a general provision is recommended which simply limits the amount of the deficiencies that might be incurred. The objective is to hold to the amounts which are included in the justifications presented in support of this supplemental for each of the authorized deficiency purposes (clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, etc.) less reductions made by the Committee in reporting the bill.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared wi estimates
	CHAPTER II			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY			
	MILITARY PERSONNEL			
91-50	Reserve personnel, Navy-----	\$8, 500, 000	\$4, 150, 000	-\$4, 350, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	<i>(3, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(3, 150, 000)</i>	<i>(-350, 000)</i>
91-94	Reserve personnel, Marine Corps-----	6, 800, 000	4, 500, 000	-2, 300, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	<i>(1, 600, 000)</i>	<i>(800, 000)</i>	<i>(-800, 000)</i>
91-50	Retired pay, Defense-----	175, 000, 000	175, 000, 000	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	<i>(13, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(13, 000, 000)</i>	-----
	Total, military personnel-----	190, 300, 000	183, 650, 000	-6, 650, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	<i>(18, 100, 000)</i>	<i>(16, 950, 000)</i>	<i>(-1, 150, 000)</i>

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Navy-----	¹ 26, 100, 000	20, 000, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----</i>	<i>(26, 100, 000)</i>	<i>(20, 000, 000)</i>
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps-----	² 4, 600, 000	3, 600, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----</i>	<i>(4, 600, 000)</i>	<i>(3, 600, 000)</i>
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard-----	13, 000, 000	10, 000, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----</i>	<i>(7, 600, 000)</i>	<i>(6, 000, 000)</i>
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard-----	15, 682, 000	8, 800, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----</i>	<i>(6, 682, 000)</i>	<i>(5, 200, 000)</i>
	Total, operation and maintenance-----	59, 382, 000	42, 400, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----</i>	<i>(44, 982, 000)</i>	<i>(34, 800, 000)</i>
	Total, chapter II:		
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	249, 682, 000	226, 050, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----</i>	<i>(63, 082, 000)</i>	<i>(51, 750, 000)</i>

¹ Also proposes that \$17,000,000 now earmarked for maintenance of real property be utilized for the general purposes of this appropriation.

² Also proposes that \$1,500,000 now earmarked for maintenance of real property be utilized for the general purposes of this appropriation.

CHAPTER III

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, KENTUCKY, *Chairman*

ROBERT N. GIAIMO, CONNECTICUT
EDWARD J. PATTEN, NEW JERSEY
DAVID PRYOR, ARKANSAS

GLENN R. DAVIS, WISCONSIN
DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., MICHIGAN
WENDELL WYATT, OREGON

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Committee recommends a total of \$10,365,000 in Federal funds and \$31,681,000 in District of Columbia funds of which \$25,353,000 is in title II and \$6,328,000 is in title III of the bill. Comparable estimates submitted in House Documents Numbered 91-50 and 91-99 total \$11,000,000 in Federal funds and \$32,309,000 in District of Columbia funds. The Committee has not considered the request of \$18,736,000 for the balance of the District's share for the capital outlay program of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, as well as the proposed loan from the Federal Treasury to finance that contribution. The proposed additional Federal payment will provide a total of \$89,365,000 for fiscal year 1969.

INCREASED PAY COSTS

The major portion of the additional \$31,681,000 in District of Columbia funds is to meet the cost of pay increases for civilian employees under Public Law 90-206, police and firemen under Public Law 90-320, judges under Public Law 90-579, teachers under Public Law 90-319, reallocations, reclassifications, and the District government's conversion to the Coordinated Federal Wage System, and wage increases for wage-board employees. The total cost of the pay increases enumerated is \$29,905,000, of which \$1,186,000 is being absorbed, leaving a total of \$28,719,000 as recommended in the bill—\$22,391,000 in title II and \$6,328,000 in title III.

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee has approved a number of program and/or mandatory increases in addition to the pay items, as follows: School transit subsidy, \$130,000; reimbursement of Federal accounts for police and fire overtime and increased U.S. courts costs incurred during the civil disturbances in April 1968, \$1,302,000; Metropolitan Police overtime, November 29-December 24, 1968, \$190,000; fire damage and overtime in correctional institutions in October 1968, \$300,000; President's Crime Program (including 10 community based centers under the work release program, intensified inservice training and training academy, 36 correctional officers at the jail, 10 correctional officers at the women's detention center, an assistant steward at the jail, and improved health services), \$129,000, to provide one month's funding for the remainder of the fiscal year. The recommendation also includes \$846,000 for the food services program in the public schools as required by Public Law 90-640, as well as \$50,000 for the settlement of claims and suits.

The Committee has not approved the additional positions and funds requested for the Police and Firemen's Clinic. It is understood that these positions are already filled on a temporary basis through the use of savings from other activities and can be continued in this manner for the remainder of the fiscal year. The additional positions and funds requested by the Court of General Sessions have also been denied inasmuch as they relate to two new judges that have not yet been appointed.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER III			
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
	FEDERAL FUNDS			
91-50	Federal payment to the District of Columbia-----	\$11, 000, 000	\$10, 365, 000	—\$635, 000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS			
91-50	General operating expenses-----	1, 070, 000	975, 000	—95, 000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----	(940, 000)	(845, 000)	(—95, 000)
91-99	Public safety-----	10, 457, 000	10, 034, 000	—423, 000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----	(8, 098, 000)	(8, 098, 000)	-----
91-50	Education-----	13, 931, 000	13, 931, 000	-----
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----	(13, 085, 000)	(13, 085, 000)	-----
91-99	Health and welfare-----	111, 000	111, 000	-----
	Increased pay costs (reallocations) (included above)—budget authority-----	(111, 000)	(111, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER III—Continued			
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Continued			
	DISTRICT FUNDS—Continued			
91-99	<i>Sanitary engineering</i> -----	\$252, 000	\$252, 000	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (reclassifications) (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	(252, 000)	(252, 000)	-----
91-99	<i>Settlement of claims and suits</i> -----	50, 000	50, 000	-----
	<i>Total, District of Columbia funds</i> -----	25, 871, 000	25, 353, 000	—\$518, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> ¹ -----	(22, 486, 000)	(22, 391, 000)	(—95, 000)
	<i>Total, chapter III, new budget (obligational) authority</i> -----	11, 000, 000	10, 365, 000	—635, 000

¹ Includes reallocations under Department of Public Health (\$111,000), and reclassifications under Department of Sanitary Engineering (\$252,000).

CHAPTER IV

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS

OTTO E. PASSMAN, LOUISIANA, *Chairman*

JOHN J. ROONEY, NEW YORK	GARNER E. SHRIVER, KANSAS
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, WASHINGTON	SILVIO O. CONTE, MASSACHUSETTS
JEFFERY COHELAN, CALIFORNIA	CHARLOTTE T. REID, ILLINOIS
CLARENCE D. LONG, MARYLAND	DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., MICHIGAN
JOHN J. McFALL, CALIFORNIA	

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (CUBAN REFUGEE PROGRAM)

The Committee considered a supplemental estimate of \$2,891,000 for the "Cuban Refugee Program," of which \$2,853,000 was in new obligational authority and \$38,000 was to be derived by transfer from reserves created in the Public Health Service Appropriations by section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-364).

The proposed supplemental would provide for the following expenses:

- (a) \$1,254,000 for unanticipated welfare costs of refugees resettled outside the Miami, Florida area,
- (b) \$755,000 for increased per-pupil rates for Cuban children in the Dade County, Florida school system,
- (c) \$844,000 for costs of transporting refugees from Cuba to Miami. This cost was previously financed by appropriations to the Department of State, and
- (d) \$38,000 for increased pay and related costs.

The Committee recommends the appropriation of \$2,700,000 in new obligational authority, a reduction of \$153,000 in the estimate, and has also approved the transfer and release of \$35,000 appropriated to the Public Health Service which were reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-50	CHAPTER IV FOREIGN OPERATIONS			
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE			
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE			
	Assistance to refugees in the United States----- (Cuban Refugee Program).	\$2, 853, 000	\$2, 700, 000	-- \$153, 000
	By transfer--increased pay costs-----	(38, 000)	(35, 000)	(--3, 000)
	Total, chapter IV:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	2, 853, 000	2, 700, 000	-- 153, 000
	By transfer--increased pay costs-----	(38, 000)	(35, 000)	(--3, 000)

CHAPTER V

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

JOE L. EVINS, TENNESSEE, *Chairman*

EDWARD P. BOLAND, MASSA-
CHUSETTS

GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, ILLINOIS

ROBERT N. GIAIMO, CONNECTICUT

JOHN O. MARSH, JR., VIRGINIA

DAVID PRYOR, ARKANSAS

CHARLES R. JONAS, NORTH
CAROLINA

LOUIS C. WYMAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

BURT L. TALCOTT, CALIFORNIA

JOSEPH M. McDADE, PENNSYLVANIA

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

The Committee considered a request for \$777,000 to enable the Office of Telecommunications Management to undertake urgently required experimentation into frequency sharing between communication satellites and terrestrial microwave systems. The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$500,000, which is \$277,000 less than the budget estimate. The Department of Commerce and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will collect additional data to supplement the experimentation provided for by this appropriation.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of \$35,000,000 to replenish the President's disaster relief fund to assist States and local governments in situations of major disasters. The Committee approved the full funding requested because of the recent disastrous floods in California and the midwest.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A supplemental appropriation of \$600,000 and the release of \$81,000 held in reserve under P.L. 90-364 is recommended for the work of this Commission. This is \$50,000 less than the budget estimate.

A recently revised agreement with the Food and Drug Administration delegates to the Federal Trade Commission the responsibility for monitoring safety and efficacy claims for some 3,300 drugs that are sold over the counter. In addition, the work of this Commission has been increased by the Truth in Lending Act, and \$521,000 is needed for pay act increases provided by law.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Committee has denied the request for language to authorize purchase of an additional aircraft to replace one that crashed last fall. Two government-owned aircraft are currently in use by the Foundation and another is being operated under lease arrangements. Total aircraft requirements of the National Science Foundation are being considered in connection with the 1970 regular budget.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

An appropriation of \$2,573,000 is recommended for certain additional expenses of the Selective Service System, including the budget estimate of \$2,139,000 for civilian and military pay increase costs, and \$434,000 for selectee travel related to an estimated induction of 20,000 selectees over earlier estimates. The Committee has denied a request of \$566,000 for 93 additional positions with the Selective Service System at this time.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

The Committee recommends the budgeted amounts for a number of supplemental items in the Veterans Administration. These include \$179,000,000 for increased compensation and pension payments; \$14,200,000 for readjustment benefits; and \$61,356,000 for medical care costs. An appropriation of \$12,000,000 is provided for general operating expenses, which is \$500,000 less than the amount requested.

The total recommended by the Committee is \$268,675,000. This sum includes \$253,146,000 in new budget authority and \$15,529,000 from the release of reserves established pursuant to provisions of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The sum of \$198,722,000 is provided to finance benefits authorized by new legislation enacted since the 1969 budget was considered. These increases are primarily for increased disability compensation and veterans education and training programs. Another \$56,581,000 is for increased pay act costs. The sum of \$13,372,000 is for added workloads and administrative expenses to implement the new legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MORTGAGE CREDIT

The budget estimates include \$50,000,000 to increase the annual contract authorizations for the homeownership assistance program (sec. 235) and \$50,000,000 for the rental housing assistance program (sec. 236), authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

An initial annual contract authorization of \$25,000,000 was provided for each of these sections last fall shortly after the legislation was enacted to give the Department an opportunity to develop and implement the programs. The demand for assistance has been such that the initial contract authorizations have been exhausted and additional amounts are needed now for both of these active programs.

The Committee recommends \$40,000,000 additional annual contract authorization for the homeownership program, and \$40,000,000 for the rental housing assistance program. Contract authorizations for these programs run over a period of 40 years and are designed to assist in providing housing for lower income families.

Further increases of \$100,000,000 annual contract authority for each program are being considered in connection with the 1970 regular budget estimates. The additional sums recommended for 1969 will enable both programs to continue until deliberations on the 1970 budget are concluded.

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The college housing program for many years has been funded by borrowings from the Treasury, but an alternative method of interest subsidies was provided by amendments in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. An initial annual contract authorization of \$3,000,000 was provided for the current fiscal year, and the budget estimate proposes that this be increased by \$4,500,000.

The Committee is recommending \$2,500,000, which is \$2,000,000 less than the budget estimate. The Committee believes that this sum will be adequate inasmuch as a number of commitments will continue to be financed by Treasury borrowing. The direct loan program is particularly applicable to smaller educational institutions, private colleges and new colleges which have little or no established credit and which experience difficulty in obtaining private financing for their requirements.

Appropriations of \$7,168,000 for the fiscal year 1968 and \$16,000,000 for 1969 are recommended for low rent public housing annual contributions contracts as proposed in the budget. These supplemental amounts are made necessary by the increasing number of low-rent public housing units becoming available and contractual commitments for which payments are required by law.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

The Committee considered a budget estimate of \$4,836,000 for payment of participation sales insufficiencies. The Committee has denied this amount until more accurate and precise amounts are determined as needed at the close of the fiscal year.

The Committee considered a supplemental estimate of \$2,000,000 for the fair housing program. No additional funding is recommended at this time. A supplemental appropriation of \$2,000,000 has previously been provided to initiate the program and the Committee is currently considering the funding needs for this activity in the 1970 budget estimates.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER V			
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
	Office of Emergency Preparedness			
91-94	Salaries and expenses, telecommunications-----	\$777, 000	\$500, 000	-\$277, 000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
	Disaster Relief			
91-94	Disaster relief-----	35, 000, 000	35, 000, 000	-----
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES			
	FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION			
	Salaries and expenses-----	650, 000	600, 000	--50, 000
	Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves-----	(81, 000)	(81, 000)	-----
	Increased pay costs (included above):			
	Budget authority-----	(500, 000)	(500, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves-----	(21, 000)	(21, 000)	-----
	Total-----	(521, 000)	(521, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER V—Continued			
	INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued			
	NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION			
91-50	<i>Salaries and expenses</i> -----	¹ <i>Language</i>	-----	-----
	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	\$3, 139, 000	\$2, 573, 000	—\$566, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	(2, 139, 000)	(2, 139, 000)	-----
	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Compensation and pensions-----	179, 000, 000	179, 000, 000	-----
91-50	Readjustment benefits-----	14, 200, 000	14, 200, 000	-----
91-50	Medical care-----	46, 189, 000	46, 189, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(15, 167, 000)	(15, 167, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(31, 395, 000)	(31, 395, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(15, 167, 000)	(15, 167, 000)	-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(46, 562, 000)	(46, 562, 000)	-----

91-50	General operating expenses-----	12, 500, 000 (7, 900, 000)	12, 000, 000 (7, 900, 000)	-500, 000 -----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----			
	Total, Veterans Administration-----	251, 889, 000	251, 389, 000	-500, 000 -----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(15, 167, 000)	(15, 167, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(39, 295, 000)	(39, 295, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(15, 167, 000)	(15, 167, 000)	-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(54, 462, 000)	(54, 462, 000)	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	MORTGAGE CREDIT			
91-50	<i>Homeownership and rental housing assistance (annual contract authoriza- tions, increase in limitations):</i>			
	<i>Homeownership assistance</i> -----	(50, 000, 000)	(40, 000, 000)	(-10, 000, 000)
	<i>Rental housing assistance</i> -----	(50, 000, 000)	(40, 000, 000)	(-10, 000, 000)
	RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE			
91-50	<i>College housing (annual contract authorization, increase in limitation)</i> -----	(4, 500, 000)	(2, 500, 000)	(-2, 000, 000)
91-50	Low rent public housing annual contributions:			
	1968-----	7, 168, 000	7, 168, 000	-----
	1969-----	16, 000, 000	16, 000, 000	-----
	Total, renewal and housing assistance-----	23, 168, 000	23, 168, 000	-----

¹ To permit purchase of one replacement aircraft from available funds at an estimated cost of \$300,000.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER V—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued			
	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT			
91-50	Payment of participation sales insufficiencies-----	\$4, 836, 000	-----	-\$4, 836, 000
91-50	Fair housing program-----	2, 000, 000	-----	-2, 000, 000
	Total, departmental management-----	6, 836, 000	-----	-6, 836, 000
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
	1968-----	7, 168, 000	\$7, 168, 000	-----
	1969-----	22, 836, 000	16, 000, 000	-6, 836, 000
	Total-----	30, 004, 000	23, 168, 000	-6, 836, 000
	<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations-----</i>	<i>(104, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(82, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(-22, 000, 000)</i>
	Total, chapter V:			
	New budget (obligational) authority:			
	1968-----	7, 168, 000	7, 168, 000	-----
	1969-----	314, 291, 000	306, 062, 000	-8, 229, 000
	Total-----	321, 459, 000	313, 230, 000	-8, 229, 000

<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations</i> -----	(104, 500, 000)	(82, 500, 000)	(-22, 000, 000)
<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(15, 248, 000)	(15, 248, 000)	-----
<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(41, 934, 000)	(41, 934, 000)	-----
<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(15, 188, 000)	(15, 188, 000)	-----
<i>Total</i> -----	(57, 122, 000)	(57, 122, 000)	-----

CHAPTER VI

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, WASHINGTON, *Chairman*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OHIO
JOHN O. MARSH, JR., VIRGINIA
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., GEORGIA
CHARLES S. JOELSON, NEW JERSEY

BEN REIFEL, SOUTH DAKOTA
JOSEPH M. McDADE,
PENNSYLVANIA
WENDELL WYATT, OREGON

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

The Committee recommends funding of \$12,488,000, the budget request, for this activity. Of the total amount provided, \$10,860,000 is for the cost of emergency fire suppression and rehabilitation of burned-over lands during the 1968 fire season, and for similar anticipated expenses in the remainder of the current fiscal year; and \$1,628,000 is for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends funding of \$3,195,000, the budget request, for this activity. Of the total amount provided, \$1,000,000 is for the suppression and emergency prevention of fires affecting forest range lands of Indian reservations, as well as the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over areas to prevent further damage from weather conditions; \$150,000 is for management of timber resources on Indian lands to assist in increased production of timber; \$1,238,000 is for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206; and \$807,000 is for wage board pay increases.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$19,000,000, the budget request, to liquidate obligations incurred as a result of the legislative taking of right, title, and interest in certain real property within the boundaries of the Redwood National Park, California, as provided by Public Law 90-545.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,092,000, the budget request, for this activity. The total amount provided includes \$300,000 to repair and replace stream-gaging installations damaged and destroyed during the record-breaking and destructive floods which occurred in southern and central California during the period

January 11-27, 1969; and \$1,792,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

The budget estimate (House Doc. 91-50) proposed the transfer of \$1,183,000 from "Solid Waste Disposal" to fund the additional pay costs for "Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources".

\$750,000 of the proposed transfer represents funds earmarked and specifically appropriated for the extinguishment of culm bank fires in Pennsylvania.

The Committee is unable to agree with this proposal in view of the fact that there is no question as to the seriousness of the situation; the Committee has investigated the matter extensively and testimony of Departmental expert witnesses consistently has supported the Committee's opinion in this connection; and funds were appropriated expressly for this purpose.

The Committee has accordingly reduced the amount to be transferred by \$750,000 with an offsetting increase of \$750,000 in new obligational authority for increased pay costs in Title III of this bill.

It is hoped this action will reaffirm to those in the Executive Branch the Committee's determination that immediate action be taken to extinguish these culm bank fires which have been a severe hazard to life and property for so many years.

HELIUM FUND

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,000,000, a reduction of \$5,000,000 below the budget request, to finance purchases of helium already contracted for by the Fund.

Testimony developed during the hearings indicated the Federal government already has quite an ample supply of helium in underground storage and it is the feeling of the Committee that those responsible for the administration of this program should make a more concerted effort to increase government sales of helium which is being acquired under the four existing purchasing contracts.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$48,000, a reduction of \$75,000 below the budget request, for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206. The decrease of \$75,000 relates to funding requested for facility surveillance and inspection programs to assure compliance with oil import regulations. The Committee is of the opinion that it is too late in the fiscal year to acquire the additional personnel to perform the additional work.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

PAYMENT TO FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$60,000, the budget request, to implement, within the 180 days specified by the statute, the Fishermen's Protective Act (Public Law 90-482). This law

authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements to indemnify the owners and crews of American fishing vessels seized or detained by a foreign country under certain conditions.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATION OF RESOURCES

The Committee recommends funding of \$1,492,000, the budget request, for this activity. Of the total amount provided, \$250,000 is for the initiation of a study of estuarine resources required by Public Law 90-454; and \$1,242,000 is for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$200,000, the budget request, for repair of storm damaged facilities at six wildlife refuges in California.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

The Committee recommends funding of \$2,674,000, the budget request, for this activity. The amount provided includes \$800,000 for actual and anticipated costs of emergency fire suppression and rehabilitation in national parks; \$1,652,000 for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206; and \$222,000 for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-320.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$100,000, the budget request, for the Washington Channel Parking Study required by Public Law 90-483.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

The Committee recommends funding of \$28,392,000, the budget request, for this activity. The amount provided includes \$21,000,000 for expenses of fighting forest fires; \$460,000 for additional sale preparation of an estimated 270 million board feet of stumpage from National Forest land in fiscal year 1969; and \$6,932,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of not to exceed \$3,000,000, the budget request, to provide Federal funds to match private gifts made to the Foundation.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-94	CHAPTER VI DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT			
	Management of land and resources-----	\$10, 410, 000	\$10, 410, 000	-----
	By transfer-----	(1, 628, 000)	(1, 628, 000)	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(275, 000)	(275, 000)	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)-----	(175, 000)	(175, 000)	-----
	Increased pay costs (included above):			
	By transfer-----	(1, 178, 000)	(1, 178, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves-----	(450, 000)	(450, 000)	-----
	Total-----	(1, 628, 000)	(1, 628, 000)	-----
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS			
91-94	Resources management-----	2, 769, 000	2, 769, 000	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(426, 000)	(426, 000)	-----
	Increased pay costs (included above):			
	Budget authority-----	(1, 619, 000)	(1, 619, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves-----	(426, 000)	(426, 000)	-----
	Total-----	(2, 045, 000)	(2, 045, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER VI—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued			
	BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION			
91-94	Land and water conservation:			
	<i>Repayable advance to the Land and Water Conservation Fund</i> -----	(\$19, 000, 000)	(\$19, 000, 000)	-----
	<i>Liquidation of obligations out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund</i> -----	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	-----
	GEOLOGICAL SURVEY			
91-94	Surveys, investigations, and research-----	2, 092, 000	2, 092, 000	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	(1, 792, 000)	(1, 792, 000)	-----
	BUREAU OF MINES			
91-50	Helium fund (borrowing authorization)-----	10, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	—\$5, 000, 000
	OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	123, 000	48, 000	—75, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	(48, 000)	(48, 000)	-----
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES			
91-50	Payment to Fishermen's Protective Fund-----	60, 000	60, 000	-----

91-94	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE		
	Management and investigations of resources-----	1, 353, 000	1, 353, 000
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(139, 000)	(139, 000)
	Construction-----	200, 000	200, 000
91-94	Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife-----		
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	1, 553, 000	1, 553, 000
	Increased pay costs (included above):	(139, 000)	(139, 000)
	Budget authority-----	(1, 103, 000)	(1, 103, 000)
91-94	Release of reserves-----		
	Total-----	(139, 000)	(139, 000)
		(1, 242, 000)	(1, 242, 000)
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE		
91-94	Management and protection-----		
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	2, 479, 000	2, 479, 000
	Increased pay costs (included above):	(195, 000)	(195, 000)
	Budget authority-----	(1, 679, 000)	(1, 679, 000)
91-94	Release of reserves-----		
	Total-----	(195, 000)	(195, 000)
		(1, 874, 000)	(1, 874, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-50	CHAPTER VI—Continued DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—Continued			
	Construction.....	\$100, 000	\$100, 000	-----
	Total, National Park Service.....	2, 579, 000	2, 579, 000	-----
	Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves.....	(195, 000)	(195, 000)	-----
	Increased pay costs (included above):			
	Budget authority.....	(1, 679, 000)	(1, 679, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves.....	(195, 000)	(195, 000)	-----
	Total.....	(1, 874, 000)	(1, 874, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of the Interior.....	29, 586, 000	24, 511, 000	—\$5, 075, 000
	Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves.....	(1, 210, 000)	(1, 210, 000)	-----
	By transfer.....	(1, 628, 000)	(1, 628, 000)	-----
	Liquidation cash.....	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	-----
	Increased pay costs (included above):			
	Budget authority.....	(6, 241, 000)	(6, 241, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves.....	(1, 210, 000)	(1, 210, 000)	-----
	By transfer.....	(1, 178, 000)	(1, 178, 000)	-----
	Total.....	(8, 629, 000)	(8, 629, 000)	-----

91-94	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE		
	FOREST SERVICE		
	Forest protection and utilization:		
	Forest land management	25, 028, 000	25, 028, 000
	Forest research	1, 564, 000	1, 564, 000
	State and private forestry cooperation	124, 000	124, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>	(1, 676, 000)	(1, 676, 000)
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(6, 932, 000)	(6, 932, 000)
	Total, Department of Agriculture, Forest Service	26, 716, 000	26, 716, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>	(1, 676, 000)	(1, 676, 000)
91-50	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(6, 932, 000)	(6, 932, 000)
	NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES		
	Salaries and expenses	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000
	Total, chapter VI:		
	New budget (obligational) authority	59, 302, 000	54, 227, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>	(2, 886, 000)	(2, 886, 000)
	<i>By transfer</i>	(1, 628, 000)	(1, 628, 000)
	<i>Liquidation cash</i>	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>		
	<i>Budget authority</i>	(13, 173, 000)	(13, 173, 000)
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(1, 210, 000)	(1, 210, 000)
	<i>By transfer</i>	(1, 178, 000)	(1, 178, 000)
	<i>Total</i>	(15, 561, 000)	(15, 561, 000)

-5, 075, 000

CHAPTER VII

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES

DANIEL J. FLOOD, PENNSYLVANIA, *Chairman*

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, KENTUCKY
NEAL SMITH, IOWA
W. R. HULL, JR., MISSOURI
BOB CASEY, TEXAS

ROBERT H. MICHEL, ILLINOIS
GARNER E. SHRIVER, KANSAS
CHARLOTTE T. REID, ILLINOIS

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The Committee considered two items for the Department of Labor, a request of \$20,000,000 for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen" and \$15,900,000 for "Employees compensation claims and expenses." Both of these are for expenses that are beyond administrative control and are strictly mathematical calculations. The Committee has included these amounts in the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The requested supplemental appropriation of \$11,161,000 included \$3,920,000 for interest subsidy grants for construction of higher education facilities and \$7,241,000 as a lump-sum payment in lieu of a land grant for the Federal City College of the District of Columbia.

The amount requested for interest subsidy grants represents the first annual interest payment on loans from non-Federal sources estimated at \$145,000,000. These loans will replace an equivalent amount of direct Federal loans that would otherwise be made. This change in the method of financing the construction of higher education facilities is authorized by Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968. The Committee has approved this request.

The lump-sum payment for the Federal City College of the District of Columbia is authorized by Public Law 90-354, approved June 20, 1968. The amount was calculated to give this new land grant college the same proportionate amount as was granted the last land grant college which was established—the University of Hawaii. The University of Hawaii was granted \$6,000,000. To arrive at the recommended appropriation for the D.C. school, this amount was divided by the 1960 population of Hawaii and the resulting per capita amount multiplied by the 1960 population of the District of Columbia. The Committee has approved this portion of the request.

The bill also includes authority to release \$160,000 of reserved funds for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

Comprehensive Health Planning and Services.—The bill includes authority to release reserves and transfer funds already appropriated in the amount of \$9,728,000, as requested. This includes \$128,000 for increased pay and related costs under Public Laws 90-206 and 90-207, and \$9,600,000 for the initiation of a program to combat a major epidemic of German measles expected in 1970.

The last German measles epidemic occurred in 1964 and resulted in over 20,000 children being born with birth defects ranging from relatively minor deficiencies, such as a missing finger or toe, to children born with severe mental retardation and those born both deaf and blind. The total eventual cost of that epidemic has been estimated as high as 2.8 billion dollars. The U.S. Public Health Service's estimate is that the cost of the 1964 epidemic will be at least one billion dollars. All indications are that an effective vaccine will be licensed within the next few weeks. This appropriation will allow the Public Health Service to start planning a vaccination program and contract for vaccine immediately after a license (or licenses) is issued.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

The 1970 budget included an item of \$15,000,000 to initiate grants and loans under the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968, Public Law 90-457. In the opinion of the Committee this matter is of sufficient urgency that it should be included in this supplemental appropriation bill rather than awaiting the regular Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970, which will likely not be enacted until a few months after the beginning of that fiscal year due to the unusual circumstance of having major revisions of the budget requests submitted to Congress on May 5.

This request is well justified both in the written material submitted to the Committee and in the hearings with government witnesses and representatives of medical interests in the District of Columbia. These hearings appear on pages 197 through 230 of the hearing record. However, the Committee was quite disturbed concerning one portion of the testimony of the U.S. Public Health Service official who is in charge of administering this program. The most pertinent portion of this testimony is as follows:

Mr. FLOOD. I am sure you, being who you are, would know enough about the situation to have what I hope is a definite opinion as to whether or not those projects already under construction and in very serious financial difficulty would be given priority if the regular procedure is followed. What is your opinion on that?

Dr. GRANING. If a project is already under construction, it is my interpretation of the enabling legislation that such a project would not be eligible for any financial assistance under this program.

This is obviously at variance with the facts. Anyone in doubt need only refer to page 12 of the report of the House Committee on the District of Columbia on the authorization bill (House Report No. 1753, 90th Congress, Second Session). The pertinent excerpt from this report follows:

The amendment to S. 1228 adopted by your Committee involves two substantive changes in the bill as it was approved by the Senate on December 15, 1967.

The first of these changes is an increase in the total authorization of grants under the bill from \$36,227,000 to \$40,052,000. The reason for this increase is that since the Senate approved the bill, the Georgetown University Medical

Center has started the construction of diagnostic and treatment facilities as a planned part of their hospital bed renovation program. Also, they have started construction of associated clinical instruction space for the professors and medical and dental students.

The cost of these facilities at Georgetown Medical Center, undertaken as part of its planned efforts to help provide adequate health services to the District of Columbia and the entire metropolitan area, is \$12,461,000. Of this amount, Georgetown University is in critical need of \$3,825,000 which your Committee feels should be provided in the grant portion of this bill.

The bill was enacted in the form reported by the House Committee on the District of Columbia. There is nothing, whatsoever, in the Act itself to prohibit the use of funds for a project on which construction had already begun. The Committee will expect the Department and the District of Columbia to follow the obvious intent of Congress rather than the personal prejudices of any individual connected with the administration of this law.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The Committee considered requests of \$373,524,000 for "Grants to States for maintenance payments" and \$278,022,000 for "Grants to States for medical assistance." After the formal requests were submitted, and after hearings on them, the Committee received a letter from John G. Veneman, Under Secretary, in which he advised the Committee that these estimates appeared to be slightly more than would be required, but that the estimates from the States indicated that the appropriation "Social services, administration, training, and demonstration projects" would be deficient by approximately \$30,000,000. He stated, "We have been continuing to monitor the State expenditures very closely in these three appropriations, and we now have their estimates of requirements for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 1969. On the basis of this information, we now believe that the total of the funds requested will be adequate but not excessive to cover the requirements of the three appropriations." These expenses were financed from one appropriation, "Grants to States for public assistance", until the Executive Branch submitted them as three separate items in the 1969 budget. The Committee has not seen any advantage to having them broken out into three appropriations, and has seen some disadvantages, of which this situation is an example. The Committee has approved the total amount requested since this is beyond administrative control and appears to be as accurate an estimate as can be made at this time. However, the Committee is combining these under one heading, "Grants to States for public assistance", and intends to combine the three separate appropriation requests for 1970 when action is taken on the regular Labor-HEW appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970.

ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES NATIONALS

The bill includes \$100,000, the amount of the request, for increased costs under this appropriation for temporary assistance for destitute American citizens whose repatriation from Cuba has recently been agreed to by the Cuban government.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER VII DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY			
91-94	Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-service- men-----	\$20, 000, 000	\$20, 000, 000	-----
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION			
91-94	Employees' compensation claims and expenses-----	15, 900, 000	15, 900, 000	-----
	Total, Department of Labor-----	35, 900, 000	35, 900, 000	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
91-50	Higher educational activities-----	11, 161, 000	11, 161, 000	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(160, 000)	(160, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—by transfer</i> -----	(160, 000)	(160, 000)	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER VII—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE— Continued			
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE			
	OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL			
91-50	Comprehensive health planning and services:			
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	¹ (\$9, 186, 000)	¹ (\$9, 186, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(292, 000)	(292, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—release of reserves</i> -----	(128, 000)	(128, 000)	-----
91-15	District of Columbia Medical Facilities-----	15, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	-----
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE			
91-50	Grants to States for maintenance payments-----	373, 524, 000	² 373, 524, 000	-----
91-50	Grants to States for medical assistance-----	278, 022, 000	² 278, 022, 000	-----
91-50	Assistance for repatriated United States Nationals-----	100, 000	100, 000	-----
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare-----	677, 807, 000	677, 807, 000	-----

<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(292, 000)	(292, 000)	-----
<i>By transfer</i> -----	(9, 346, 000)	(9, 346, 000)	-----
<i>Increased pay costs:</i>			
<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(128, 000)	(128, 000)	-----
<i>By transfer</i> -----	(160, 000)	(160, 000)	-----
<i>Total</i> -----	(288, 000)	(288, 000)	-----
<i>Total, chapter VII:</i>			
<i>New budget (obligational) authority</i> -----	713, 707, 000	713, 707, 000	-----
<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(292, 000)	(292, 000)	-----
<i>By transfer</i> -----	(9, 346, 000)	(9, 346, 000)	-----
<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(128, 000)	(128, 000)	-----
<i>By transfer</i> -----	(160, 000)	(160, 000)	-----
<i>Total</i> -----	(288, 000)	(288, 000)	-----

¹ And an additional \$250,000 proposed to be made available through congressional action to reduce funds earmarked for planning grants.

² Combined under the heading "Grants to States for public assistance" in the bill. This is explained on page 43 of this report.

CHAPTER VIII

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

GEORGE W. ANDREWS, ALABAMA, *Chairman*

TOM STEED, OKLAHOMA
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OHIO
SIDNEY R. YATES, ILLINOIS
BOB CASEY, TEXAS

MARK ANDREWS, NORTH DAKOTA
ODIN LANGEN, MINNESOTA
BEN REIFEL, SOUTH DAKOTA
LOUIS C. WYMAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

\$30,000 of new budget (obligational) authority is recommended in this chapter of the bill to pay the customary gratuity in connection with the death of a Member last January. There are also three language provisions.

Office of the Speaker.—The committee has inserted language, as requested, to raise, by \$2,230, the basic lump-sum ceiling allowance—now at \$30,025—applicable under this appropriation. No increase in the actual appropriation is necessary on this account. Counting in the general pay supplemental in title III, a small surplus on the present basis is projected.

Contingent fund.—The bill includes language to transfer \$36,000 of existing contingent funds of the House to the Architect of the Capitol to piece out the amount estimated to be needed to continue operations of House dining facilities for the remainder of fiscal 1969. It supplements the \$175,000 interim allocation in the regular 1969 bill last year, for a total of \$211,000.

This \$211,000 sharply contrasts with the \$478,000 (or \$536,000, if the effect of the pending Coordinated Wage Board system is counted) in prospect for fiscal 1969 when the bill was considered last year. And this was on the heels of an operating loss of \$366,000 in fiscal 1968.

The request last year was sharply cut back; steps were ordered to bring in more revenue and reduce expenses; and an in-depth study by the General Accounting Office of the entire food service operation was ordered. The \$175,000 interim allocation for 1969 was regarded as probably sufficient for 6 to 7 months. Through February 8 (the 8th and 13 accounting periods), \$130,000 was used. \$81,000, roughly, is estimated from then to June 30, and with only \$45,000 available, \$36,000 additional was indicated as necessary to continue to June 30.

It is the committee's present plan to go into the GAO study, which has been completed, in connection with hearings on the 1970 budget. In the meantime, the Architect should take advantage of any additional economy measures that may suggest themselves as reasonable and acceptable.

House office buildings.—The committee has inserted language, in accord with the request of the Select Committee on Parking, to adjust the basis for compensating the Superintendent of Garages.

This position, and the current rate for it, was specifically set by action in the appropriation bill. The proposition here is to put the compensation on the same "basic" rate footing like many House employees generally, rather than at a specified gross rate, and to adjust the annual compensation from the present \$14,000 to \$16,509.

The normal spread between the top job and the assistant was considerably narrowed when the latter, which is under the wage-board system, was reclassified last fall. The language is intended to restore the situation.

ITEMS IN TITLE III (PAY COSTS)

Title III of the bill, relating to increased pay costs throughout the government generally (where not specifically provided in title II), includes \$9,929,970 in new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal 1969 for those activities of the Legislative Branch considered by the committee. This is \$1,247,340, or about 11%, below the corresponding pay increase budget requests of \$11,177,310 not counting \$3,397,602 in 1969 and \$126,900 for 1968, pertaining solely to the other body inasmuch as the practice is to leave those items for consideration by that body.

Under the law, Legislative Branch requests are not subject to amendment by the President. What the committee did was to have a summary analysis made of the various legislative supplemental requests, taking account of reestimates based on later expenditure experience—generally in the principal items. The results are reflected in the several amounts in the bill.

The extent of practical ability to absorb the increased costs varies considerably. Many of the appropriations are small, involving specific complements of varying numbers of personnel in offices where the workload is more or less steady and the positions are statutory. Item-by-item allowances are shown in the detailed table of this report related to title III, but generally, the Architect's items involve about 18% absorption of costs; the Library, about 32%; the office of Superintendent of Documents, about 28%; the General Accounting Office, about 20%. Reductions of \$214,565 were made in requests directly relating to the House. Two of the joint items were deleted, another reduced.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER VIII			
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
-----	Gratuity to mother of a deceased Member-----	-----	\$30, 000	+\$30, 000
	SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES			
-----	Office of the Speaker-----	-----	(1)	-----
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES			
-----	Miscellaneous items-----	-----	(1)	-----
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
-----	House office buildings-----	-----	(1)	-----
	Total, chapter VIII— New budget (obligational) authority----	(2)	30, 000	+ 30, 000

¹ Language provision.

² Excludes \$126,900 for 1968 relating to a Senate item. (H. Doc. 91-94)

CHAPTER IX

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, FLORIDA
JOHN M. SLACK, WEST
VIRGINIA
NEAL SMITH, IOWA
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., GEORGIA
CHARLES S. JOELSON, NEW
JERSEY

FRANK T. BOW, OHIO
GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
CALIFORNIA
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,
MICHIGAN
MARK ANDREWS, NORTH DAKOTA

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

The Committee recommends an additional \$65,000 for this item of which \$25,000 is for executive level salary increases and \$40,000 is for the data processing project within the Customs section of the Civil Division.

Language is also included in the bill which provides an additional \$233,000, to be derived by transfer, to cover pay act costs and wage board increases.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

Included in the bill is the additional sum of \$1,314,000 for this item which is a reduction of \$353,000 in the amount of the budget estimate. Of the amount allowed, \$840,000 is for classified employee pay increases; \$38,000 is for executive pay increases; \$298,000 is for revised standards of attorney positions, and \$138,000 is to provide for all of the additional positions requested for the Tax, Criminal and Civil Rights Divisions for approximately one month of the 1969 fiscal year. The reductions recommended in this item as well as position requests in other Department of Justice supplemental appropriations are due to the fact that the requests for funds for additional positions were for a period of three months whereas it now appears it will only be possible to fill the positions for approximately one month during the current fiscal year.

Language is also included providing an additional \$100,000 to be derived by transfer and for the release of \$100,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, to defray costs of the pay act.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

The Committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate, \$99,000, as well as language providing for an additional \$262,000 to be derived by transfer and the release of \$90,000 reserved pursuant to Section 201 of Public Law 90-364. The additional funds provided are for increased pay costs and for revised standards of attorney positions.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

An additional \$2,505,000 plus language providing for the release of \$150,000 reserved pursuant to Section 201 of P.L. 90-364 is included in the accompanying bill for this item. Of the additional amount allowed, \$1,468,000 is for classified and executive pay increases; \$175,000 for revised standards for attorneys and deputy marshals; \$300,000 for increased volume and cost of transcripts; \$400,000 for increases in premium pay costs, overtime costs and guard hire; and \$162,000 for 43 assistant United States attorneys, 43 clerks, and 30 additional deputy marshals. All of the requested positions have been allowed.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

The full amount of the budget estimate, \$2,319,000, and language providing for the release of \$250,000 reserved pursuant to Section 201 of Public Law 90-364, is included in the bill. The amount allowed is to provide for pay act costs and for keeping a larger than anticipated number of prisoners confined in Federal institutions.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

The bill also includes \$2,500,000, the full amount of the budget estimate, for keeping a larger than anticipated number of Federal prisoners confined in non-Federal institutions and also to cover increased rates.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an additional \$1,187,000 plus language providing for the release of \$400,000 reserved under section 201 of Public Law 90-364 for this item. The amount allowed by the Committee provides for the full amount requested for laboratory supplies and equipment. It also provides for the additional positions requested. The full amount requested for pay act costs is also included. The sum of \$37,000 is provided for rent and installation of additional radio communications.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

Language is included in the bill reducing the amount required to be advanced from "Operations and Administration" to the Small Business Administration from \$2,000,000 to \$1,200,000 and also providing for the release of \$116,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364. These funds are to be used to defray pay act costs.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

Language is recommended providing for the transfer of \$210,000 to this item from the fiscal year 1969 appropriation "Ship Construction." This amount is for liquidation of obligations incurred for payment of allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at State Marine Schools. This transfer will in no way affect the actual construction of ships inasmuch as the transfer is from funds provided for administrative and warehouse expenses.

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

Included in the bill is an additional \$27,000 for fiscal year 1969 and an additional \$10,000 for fiscal year 1968 for printing and binding Supreme Court reports. These additional funds are required as a result of increased printing costs.

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The sum of \$113,000 is included in the bill for this item of which \$92,900 is for increased pay costs and \$20,100 is for salaries for temporary and part-time employees.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF JUDGES

The sum of \$1,975,000, a reduction of \$100,000 in the request, is provided in the bill to cover increased pay costs and to provide the salary for nine new circuit judges and three additional senior judges.

SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

A total of \$2,412,000, a reduction of \$453,000 in the amount requested, is provided for this item. Of the amount allowed, \$2,165,000 is for pay act costs; \$42,000 is for the salaries of secretaries and law clerks for the new circuit judges; \$130,000 is for reclassification of law clerks; and \$75,000 is for 83 additional deputy clerks. The funds for the additional deputy clerks are provided for the administration of the new jury system and for the issuance of passports.

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Also included in the bill, is the sum of \$400,000 of which \$150,000 is for expenses relating to the nine new circuit judges and \$250,000 is for administration of the new jury system.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

The Committee recommends an additional \$97,500 for this office of which \$87,500 is for pay act costs and \$10,000 is to cover costs of 5 additional positions.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER IX			
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
91-98	Salaries and expenses, general administration-----	\$127, 000	\$65, 000	—\$62, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)-----</i>	<i>(233, 000)</i>	<i>(233, 000)</i>	<i>-----</i>
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority-----</i>	<i>(25, 000)</i>	<i>(25, 000)</i>	<i>-----</i>
	<i>Release of reserves-----</i>	<i>(233, 000)</i>	<i>(233, 000)</i>	<i>-----</i>
91-98	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities-----	1, 667, 000	1, 314, 000	—353, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)-----</i>	<i>(100, 000)</i>	<i>(100, 000)</i>	<i>-----</i>
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----</i>	<i>(100, 000)</i>	<i>(100, 000)</i>	<i>-----</i>
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority-----</i>	<i>(878, 000)</i>	<i>(878, 000)</i>	<i>-----</i>
	<i>Release of reserves-----</i>	<i>(200, 000)</i>	<i>(200, 000)</i>	<i>-----</i>

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER IX—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued			
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—Continued			
91-98	Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	\$99, 000	\$99, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto).....</i>	<i>(262, 000)</i>	<i>(262, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(90, 000)</i>	<i>(90, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority.....</i>	<i>(5, 000)</i>	<i>(5, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Release of reserves.....</i>	<i>(352, 000)</i>	<i>(352, 000)</i>	-----
91-98	Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals.....	2, 833, 000	2, 505, 000	--\$328, 000
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(150, 000)</i>	<i>(150, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority.....</i>	<i>(1, 468, 000)</i>	<i>(1, 468, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Release of reserves.....</i>	<i>(150, 000)</i>	<i>(150, 000)</i>	-----
	Total, legal activities and general administration.....	4, 726, 000	3, 983, 000	--743, 000

91-50	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(935, 000)	(935, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(2, 376, 000)	(2, 376, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(935, 000)	(935, 000)	-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(3, 311, 000)	(3, 311, 000)	-----
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM			
	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons-----	2, 319, 000	2, 319, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(250, 000)	(250, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(1, 842, 000)	(1, 842, 000)	-----
91-98	<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(250, 000)	(250, 000)	-----
	Support of United States Prisoners-----	2, 500, 000	2, 500, 000	-----
	Total, Federal Prison System-----	4, 819, 000	4, 819, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(250, 000)	(250, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(1, 842, 000)	(1, 842, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(250, 000)	(250, 000)	-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(2, 092, 000)	(2, 092, 000)	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER IX—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued			
	BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	\$1, 422, 000	\$1, 187, 000	—\$235, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(400, 000)	(400, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(450, 000)	(450, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(400, 000)	(400, 000)	-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(850, 000)	(850, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of Justice-----	10, 967, 000	9, 989, 000	--978, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(1, 585, 000)	(1, 585, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(4, 668, 000)	(4, 668, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(1, 585, 000)	(1, 585, 000)	-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(6, 253, 000)	(6, 253, 000)	-----

91-94	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE			
	Operations and administration (<i>release of P.L. 364 reserves</i>)-----	¹ (116, 000)	¹ (116, 000)	-----
91-50	Increased pay costs (<i>included above</i>)— <i>release of reserves</i> -----	(116, 000)	(116, 000)	-----
	MARITIME ADMINISTRATION			
	State marine schools (<i>liquidation of obligations—by transfer</i>)-----	(210, 000)	(210, 000)	-----
91-94	THE JUDICIARY			
	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES			
	Printing and binding Supreme Court reports:			
	1969-----	27, 000	27, 000	-----
	1968-----	10, 000	10, 000	-----
91-94	Total, Supreme Court of the United States-----	37, 000	37, 000	-----
	CUSTOMS COURT			
	Salaries and expenses-----	155, 850	113, 000	--42, 850
	Increased pay costs (<i>included above</i>)— <i>budget authority</i> -----	(92, 900)	(92, 900)	-----
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES			
91-94	Salaries of judges-----	2, 075, 000	1, 975, 000	--100, 000
	Increased pay costs (<i>included above</i>)— <i>budget authority</i> -----	(1, 830, 000)	(1, 830, 000)	-----
	Salaries of supporting personnel-----	2, 865, 000	2, 412, 000	--453, 000
91-50	Increased pay costs (<i>included above</i>)— <i>budget authority</i> -----	(2, 165, 000)	(2, 165, 000)	-----

¹ Also language reducing by \$800,000 the amount to be advanced from this appropriation to the Small Business Administration for loan processing services.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—Continued

II. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER IX—Continued			
	THE JUDICIARY—Continued			
	Courts of Appeals, District Courts and Other Judicial Services—Con.			
91-50	Travel and miscellaneous expenses-----	\$525, 000	\$400, 000	—\$125, 000
91-94	Administrative Office of the United States Courts-----	141, 500	97, 500	—44, 000
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(10, 000)	(10, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(87, 500)	(87, 500)	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(10, 000)	(10, 000)	-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(97, 500)	(97, 500)	-----
	Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services--	5, 606, 500	4, 884, 500	—722, 000
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(10, 000)	(10, 000)	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(4, 082, 500)	(4, 082, 500)	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(10, 000)	(10, 000)	-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(4, 092, 500)	(4, 092, 500)	-----
	Total, the Judiciary:			
	1969-----	5, 789, 350	5, 024, 500	—764, 850

1968-----	10,000	10,000	-----
Total-----	5,799,350	5,034,500	-764,850
By transfer-----	(10,000)	(10,000)	-----
Increased pay costs (included above):			
Budget authority-----	(4,175,400)	(4,175,400)	-----
By transfer-----	(10,000)	(10,000)	-----
Total-----	(4,185,400)	(4,185,400)	-----
Total, chapter IX:			
New budget (obligational) authority:			
1969-----	16,756,350	15,013,500	-1,742,850
1968-----	10,000	10,000	-----
Total-----	16,766,350	15,023,500	-1,742,850
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	-----
By transfer-----	(220,000)	(220,000)	-----
Increased pay costs (included above):			
Budget authority-----	(8,843,400)	(8,843,400)	-----
Release of reserves-----	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	-----
By transfer-----	(10,600)	(10,000)	-----
Total-----	(10,554,400)	(10,554,400)	-----

CHAPTER X

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

EDWARD P. BOLAND, MASSACHUSETTS, *Chairman*

JOHN J. MCFALL, CALIFORNIA
SIDNEY R. YATES, ILLINOIS

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, OHIO
SILVIO O. CONTE, MASSACHUSETTS

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of \$298,000 and the release of \$28,000 now in reserve for the National Transportation Safety Board. The funds recommended will enable the Board to investigate the increased number of catastrophic accidents which have occurred during fiscal 1969 and to meet increased pay costs. The current rate of major aviation accident investigations is three times that of fiscal year 1968.

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

The Committee considered a budget request of \$2,300,000 for payments to retired Coast Guard personnel. Recent recomputations indicate that a \$2,000,000 appropriation will be sufficient.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II

Il. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-94	CHAPTER X DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD			
	Salaries and expenses-----	\$298, 000 (28, 000)	\$298, 000 (28, 000)	-----
	Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves-----			-----
	Increased pay costs (included above):			
	Budget authority-----	(150, 000)	(150, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves-----	(28, 000)	(28, 000)	-----
	Total-----	(178, 000)	(178, 000)	-----
91-50	COAST GUARD			
	Retired pay-----	2, 300, 000	2, 000, 000	-\$300, 000
	Total, chapter X:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	2, 598, 000	2, 298, 000	---300, 000
	Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves-----	(28, 000)	(28, 000)	-----
	Increased pay costs (included above):			
	Budget authority-----	(150, 000)	(150, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves-----	(28, 000)	(28, 000)	-----
	Total-----	(178, 000)	(178, 000)	-----

CHAPTER XI

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTS OF TREASURY AND POST OFFICE AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE

TOM STEED, OKLAHOMA, *Chairman*

OTTO E. PASSMAN, LOUISIANA	SILVIO O. CONTE, MASSACHUSETTS
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, NEW YORK	HOWARD W. ROBISON, NEW YORK
JEFFERY COHELAN, CALIFORNIA	JACK EDWARDS, ALABAMA

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

The Committee recommends the full amount of the request for new funds of \$1,978,000, together with the release of \$334,000 of funds in reserve.

These additional funds are required for reimbursement to paying agents in connection with redemption of securities (\$572,000); reimbursement to Federal Reserve Banks for operating expenses incurred as Treasury Department's fiscal agents (\$863,000); and the remainder of \$543,000 in new funds plus the \$334,000 of funds in reserve for pay act increases.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends the full amount of the request of \$107,000.

Of the \$107,000 recommended, \$65,000 is for increased economic studies, \$31,000 is for increased pay under Public Law 90-206 and \$11,000 is to fund the new executive pay increase.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends the full amount of the request of \$200,000.

These additional funds are required because of increased utilization of the Council by the President. The President announced that he intends to revitalize the Council and make it a principal forum for the consideration of national problems.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-50	CHAPTER XI			
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT			
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT			
	Administering the public debt.....	\$1, 978, 000	\$1, 978, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(334, 000)</i>	<i>(334, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority.....</i>	<i>(543, 000)</i>	<i>(543, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Release of reserves.....</i>	<i>(334, 000)</i>	<i>(334, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Total.....</i>	<i>(877, 000)</i>	<i>(877, 000)</i>	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND
AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER XI—Continued			
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
	COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	\$107, 000	\$107, 000	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority-----</i>	<i>(42, 000)</i>	<i>(42, 000)</i>	-----
	NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	200, 000	200, 000	-----
	Total, Executive Office of the President-----	307, 000	307, 000	-----
	Total, chapter XI:			
	New budget obligatory authority-----	2, 285, 000	2, 285, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----</i>	<i>(334, 000)</i>	<i>(334, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>			
	<i>Budget authority-----</i>	<i>(585, 000)</i>	<i>(585, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Release of reserves-----</i>	<i>(334, 000)</i>	<i>(334, 000)</i>	-----
	<i>Total-----</i>	<i>(919, 000)</i>	<i>(919, 000)</i>	-----

CHAPTER XII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

The Committee recommends the appropriation of \$16,880,812, the amount of the estimate, for claims and judgments rendered against the United States. Of this amount, \$13,081,416 represents damage and other type claims, the payments of which are due under various laws, and \$3,799,396 represents judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims and U.S. District Courts. Details concerning these claims and judgments are contained in House Document No. 101, 91st Congress.

CHAPTER XII
CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS
COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-101	CHAPTER XII Claims and judgments-----	\$16, 880, 812	\$16, 880, 812	-----

TITLE III

INCREASED PAY COSTS

This title of the bill includes the bulk of the supplemental funds to meet the unabsorbed portion of increased pay and related costs which have been incurred during fiscal 1969 under several enactments of the last session. There are some funds for this purpose intermingled with non-pay supplementals in title II. The regular 1969 appropriations did not include specific allowance for these costs; agencies have been running on a deficiency basis as the law allows in such instances.

The greatest portion of the costs and added funds stem from the so-called second phase comparability pay adjustments generally effective last July 1st, under Public Laws 90-206 and 90-207, with respect to postal, other civilian employees, and military personnel. District of Columbia teachers and school officers, police, and firemen pay increases under Public Laws 90-319 and 90-320 are also involved, as are wage-board prevailing wage adjustments and certain other administratively adjusted salaries. Also, provision is made for executive, legislative, and judicial salary increases pursuant to P.L. 90-206.

When the pay supplementals for 1969 were first formulated and reflected in the January budget, the aggregate cost for 1969 was estimated at \$2,069,000,000, and in the aggregate the Executive Branch proposed to absorb nearly 25 percent from previously appropriated funds.

The new administration reviewed the supplementals and submitted a number of revisions, the revised budget requests for new budget (obligational) authority—in titles II and III combined—being \$1,589,223,194. Details are reflected in H. Docs. 91-50; 85; 94; and 98. The committee has made a number of reductions from that total; the details are reflected item-by-item in the tabular pages that follow. The total committee cut in this figure is \$289,489,340, or about 18 percent, by far the largest portion—\$272,600,000—being in the Defense Department. The total committee allowance is \$1,299,733,854.

The Executive Branch had combed the estimates initially and the new administration had also reexamined them. Since the estimates are for mandatory-type costs that have been running all fiscal year, the Committee could not make drastic additional cuts all across the boards this late in the fiscal year without creating unacceptable disruption to operations.

There are many transfer and reserve release provisions throughout title III of the bill, all of which help to hold down the amount of new budget authority that would otherwise be necessary.

Here is a capsule of the totals of new budget (obligational) authority involved for pay cost increases in both titles:

	Budget authority requests	In bill	Reduction
Title II.....	\$127,767,400	\$116,435,400	—\$11,332,000
Title III.....	1,461,455,794	1,183,298,454	—278,157,340
Total.....	1,589,223,194	1,299,733,854	—289,489,340

¹ In addition, releases of P.L. 90-364 reserves and transfers, etc. in existing funds. See page 10 for a summary of these.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
	COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS			
91-94	Compensation of members-----	\$1, 975, 000	\$1, 975, 000	-----
	SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES			
91-50	Office of the Speaker-----	4, 015	4, 015	-----
91-94	Office of the Parliamentarian-----	12, 935	12, 935	-----
91-50	Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives-----	670	670	-----
91-50	Office of the Chaplain-----	1, 250	1, 250	-----
91-50	Office of the Clerk-----	110, 000	110, 000	-----
91-50	Office of the Sergeant at Arms-----	192, 000	192, 000	-----
91-50	Office of the Doorkeeper-----	115, 000	65, 000	—\$50, 000
91-94	Office of the Postmaster-----	40, 875	40, 875	-----
91-50	Committee employees-----	500, 000	400, 000	—100, 000
91-50 91-94	Special and minority employees (several items)-----	37, 550	36, 485	—1, 065
91-50	Official reporters of debates-----	27, 000	27, 000	-----

91-50	Official reporters to committees-----	24, 760	24, 760	-----
91-94	Office of the Legislative Counsel-----	49, 100	25, 600	--23, 500
	Total, salaries, officers and employees-----	1, 115, 155	940, 590	--174, 565
91-94	MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE			
	Clerk hire-----	3, 090, 000	3, 050, 000	--40, 000
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE			
91-50	Special and select committees-----	129, 000	129, 000	-----
91-94	Revision of laws-----	1, 490	1, 490	-----
91-50	Speaker's automobile-----	665	665	-----
91-50	Majority leader's automobile-----	665	665	-----
91-50	Minority leader's automobile-----	665	665	-----
	Total, contingent expenses of the House-----	132, 485	132, 485	-----
	Total, House of Representatives-----	6, 312, 640	6, 098, 075	--214, 565
	JOINT ITEMS			
91-50	Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures-----	3, 100	-----	--3, 100
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE			
91-94	Joint Economic Committee-----	22, 025	13, 500	--8, 525
91-94	Joint Committee on Atomic Energy-----	17, 820	17, 820	-----
91-94	Joint Committee on Printing-----	12, 425	12, 425	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS —Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued			
	JOINT ITEMS—Continued			
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE			
91-94	Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation-----	\$27,250	-----	-\$27,250
91-50	Joint Committee on Defense Production-----	7,950	\$7,950	-----
	Total, joint items-----	90,570	51,695	-38,875
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
91-50	OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
	Salaries-----	36,000	36,000	-----
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS			
91-50	Capitol buildings-----	74,500	74,500	-----
91-50	Capitol grounds-----	25,600	25,600	-----
91-50	House office buildings-----	320,000	300,000	-20,000
91-50	Capitol power plant-----	27,500	27,500	-----
	LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS			
91-50	Structural and mechanical care-----	28,000	28,000	-----
	Total, Architect of the Capitol-----	511,600	491,600	-20,000

BOTANIC GARDEN

91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	22, 500	22, 500	-----
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS				
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	766, 000	579, 300	-186, 700
91-50	Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses-----	122, 000	109, 800	-12, 200
91-94	Legislative Reference Service: Salaries and expenses-----	220, 000	170, 000	-50, 000
	<i>By transfer</i> -----		(50, 000)	(+50, 000)
91-50	Distribution of catalog cards: Salaries and expenses-----	150, 000	-----	-150, 000
91-50	Books for the blind and physically handicapped: Salaries and expenses-----	23, 000	-----	-23, 000
91-50	Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents: Salaries and expenses-----	6, 000	6, 000	-----
91-50	Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)-----	11, 000	9, 000	-2, 000
	^{B**} Total, Library of Congress-----	1, 298, 000	874, 100	-423, 900
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE				
91-50	Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses-----	228, 000	178, 000	-50, 000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE				
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	2, 714, 000	2, 214, 000	-500, 000
	Total, Legislative Branch: New budget (obligational) authority-----	¹ 11, 177, 310	9, 929, 970	-1, 247, 340
	<i>By transfer</i> -----		(50, 000)	(+50, 000)

¹ Excludes \$3,397,602 for 1969 relating to Senate items under that heading and under the Architect of the Capitol.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	THE JUDICIARY			
	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES			
91-94	Salaries-----	\$120, 000	\$120, 000	-----
91-50	Care of the buildings and grounds-----	15, 900	15, 900	-----
	Total, Supreme Court of the United States-----	135, 900	135, 900	-----
	COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	16, 000	16, 000	-----
	COURT OF CLAIMS			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	64, 000	64, 000	-----
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES			
91-50	Expenses of referees-----	248, 000	248, 000	-----
91-94	Salaries of referees-----	404, 000	404, 000	-----
	Total, Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services-----	652, 000	652, 000	-----
	Total, the Judiciary: New budget (obligational) authority-----	867, 900	867, 900	-----

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

91-50 Compensation of the President.....

44, 584

44, 584

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

91-50 Salaries and expenses.....

178, 000

50, 000

—\$128, 000

Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves.....

(355, 000)

(355, 000)

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

91-50 Salaries and expenses.....

100, 000

100, 000

Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves.....

(70, 000)

(70, 000)

91-50 Salaries and expenses, Telecommunications (*release of P.L. 90-364 reserves*).....

(40, 000)

(40, 000)

91-50 Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....

30, 000

30, 000

Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves.....

(40, 000)

(40, 000)

Total, Office of Emergency Preparedness.....

130, 000

130, 000

Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves.....

(150, 000)

(150, 000)

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

91-50 Salaries and expenses (*reserves of P.L. 90-364 reserves*).....

(28, 000)

(28, 000)

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

91-94 Salaries and expenses.....

32, 000

32, 000

Total, Executive Office of the President:

New budget (obligational) authority.....

384, 584

256, 584

—128, 000

Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves.....

(533, 000)

(533, 000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
	ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
91-50	Administrative expenses, Agency for International Development (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(\$2, 137, 000)	(\$1, 500, 000)	(--\$637, 000)
91-50	Administrative and other expenses, Department of State (<i>by transfer</i>)--	(95, 000)	(75, 000)	(--20, 000)
	Total, funds appropriated to the President, economic assistance (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(2, 232, 000)	(1, 575, 000)	(--657, 000)
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(6, 615, 000)	(6, 615, 000)	-----
	COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-94	Payments and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(81, 000)	(81, 000)	-----
	FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE			
91-50	Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(135, 000)	(135, 000)	-----
	FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	73, 000	73, 000	-----

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE			
91-50	Conservation operations-----	3, 980, 000	3, 980, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(1, 000, 000)	(1, 000, 000)
91-50	Watershed planning-----	254, 000	254, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(90, 000)	(90, 000)
91-50	River basin surveys and investigations-----	306, 000	306, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(90, 000)	(90, 000)
91-50	Watershed works of improvement-----	688, 000	688, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(300, 000)	(300, 000)
91. 50	Flood prevention-----	224, 000	224, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(128, 000)	(128, 000)
91-50	Great Plains conservation program-----	160, 000	160, 000
91-50	Resource conservation and development-----	111, 000	111, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(100, 000)	(100, 000)
	Total, Soil Conservation Service-----	5, 723, 000	5, 723, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(1, 708, 000)	(1, 708, 000)
ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	684, 000	684, 000
STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	527, 000	527, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued			
	CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE			
91-85	Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs-----	\$2, 897, 000	\$2, 300, 000	—\$597, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(400, 000)	(600, 000)	(+ 200, 000)
91-50	Special milk program (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(15, 000)	(15, 000)	-----
	FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(362, 000)	(362, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(68, 000)	(68, 000)	-----
	COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	65, 000	65, 000	-----
	AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE			
91-50	Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(4, 508, 000)	(4, 108, 000)	(— 400, 000)
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(251, 000)	(551, 000)	(+ 300, 000)
	RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	18, 000	18, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(9, 000)	(9, 000)	-----

91-50	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL Salaries and expenses-----	568, 000	568, 000	-----
	PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	49, 000	49, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(64, 000)	(64, 000)	-----
	OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	239, 000	239, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF INFORMATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	58, 000	58, 000	-----
	NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	40, 000	40, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(35, 000)	(35, 000)	-----
	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	116, 000	116, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(9, 000)	(9, 000)	-----
	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	188, 000	188, 000	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(36, 000)	(36, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(30, 000)	(30, 000)	-----
	RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	624, 000	624, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(11, 000)	(11, 000)	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doe. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	\$1, 809, 000	\$1, 359, 000	—\$450, 000
	By transfer-----	(276, 000)	(676, 000)	(+ 400, 000)
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)-----	(215, 000)	(215, 000)	-----
	FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION			
91-50	Administrative and operating expenses-----	274, 000	274, 000	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364-----	(97, 000)	(97, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of Agriculture:			
	New budget (obligational authority)-----	13, 952, 000	12, 905, 000	—1, 047, 000
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(9, 743, 000)	(10, 243, 000)	(+ 500, 000)
	By transfer-----	(5, 182, 000)	(5, 182, 000)	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	218, 000	218, 000	-----
	By transfer-----	(75, 000)	(75, 000)	-----

91-94	OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS			
	<i>Salaries and expenses (by transfer)</i> -----	(75, 000)	(75, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(59, 000)	(59, 000)	-----
	BUREAU OF THE CENSUS			=====
91-50	<i>Salaries and expenses</i> -----	567, 000	567, 000	-----
91-50	<i>1967 economic censuses</i> -----	285, 000	285, 000	-----
	<i>Total, Bureau of the Census</i> -----	852, 000	852, 000	-----
	BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			=====
91-50	<i>Salaries and expenses</i> -----	206, 000	206, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(36, 000)	(36, 000)	-----
	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES			=====
91-50	<i>Salaries and expenses</i> -----	200, 000	200, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(163, 000)	(163, 000)	-----
91-50	<i>Export control</i> -----	136, 000	136, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(60, 000)	(60, 000)	-----
	Total, International activities-----	336, 000	336, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(223, 000)	(223, 000)	-----
	OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES			=====
91-50	<i>Salaries and expenses</i> -----	142, 000	142, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(77, 000)	(77, 000)	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued			
	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	\$3, 254, 000	\$3, 254, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(786, 000)	(786, 000)	-----
91-50	Research and development-----	614, 000	614, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(117, 000)	(117, 000)	-----
	Total, Environmental Science Services Administration-----	3, 868, 000	3, 868, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(903, 000)	(903, 000)	-----
91-50	PATENT OFFICE			
	Salaries and expenses-----	1, 240, 000	1, 240, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(321, 000)	(321, 000)	-----
91-50	NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS			
	Research and technical services-----	1, 100, 000	1, 100, 000	-----
91-50	MARITIME ADMINISTRATION			
	Salaries and expenses, for administrative expenses-----	261, 000	261, 000	-----

91-94	Maritime training-----	100, 000	100, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(99, 000)	(99, 000)	-----
	Total, Maritime Administration-----	361, 000	361, 000	-----
	FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL			=====
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	173, 000	173, 000	-----
	Total, Department of Commerce:			-----
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	8, 496, 000	8, 496, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(1, 718, 000)	(1, 718, 000)	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(150, 000)	(150, 000)	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--MILITARY			=====
	MILITARY PERSONNEL			-----
91-50	Military personnel, Army-----	331, 000, 000	230, 000, 000	-\$101, 000, 000
91-50	Military personnel, Navy-----	198, 700, 000	160, 000, 000	-38, 700, 000
91-94	Military personnel, Marine Corps-----	61, 500, 000	45, 000, 000	-16, 500, 000
91-50	Military personnel, Air Force-----	267, 600, 000	214, 000, 000	-53, 600, 000
91-50	Reserve personnel, Army-----	5, 600, 000	-----	-5, 600, 000
91-50	Reserve personnel, Air Force-----	1, 900, 000	-----	-1, 900, 000
91-50	National Guard personnel, Army-----	16, 400, 000	13, 000, 000	-3, 400, 000
91-50	National Guard personnel, Air Force-----	3, 400, 000	-----	-3, 400, 000
	Total, military personnel-----	886, 100, 000	662, 000, 000	-224, 100, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY—Continued			
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Army-----	\$106,800,000	\$85,000,000	--\$21,800,000
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Air Force-----	91,200,000	73,000,000	--18,200,000
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies-----	40,500,000	32,000,000	--8,500,000
91-50	Court of Military Appeals-----	18,000	18,000	-----
	Total, operation and maintenance-----	238,518,000	190,018,000	--48,500,000
	Total, Department of Defense—Military:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	1,124,618,000	852,018,000	--272,600,000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

91-50	Operation and maintenance, general-----	1, 731, 000	1, 731, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> -----	(1, 869, 000)	(1, 869, 000)	-----
91-50	General expenses (<i>release of P. L. 90-364 reserves and transfer hereto</i>)-----	(1, 131, 000)	(1, 000, 000)	(-131, 000)
	Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil-----	1, 731, 000	1, 731, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(3, 000, 000)	(2, 869, 000)	(-131, 000)

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

91-50	Operation and maintenance (<i>release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(181, 000)	(181, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of the Army-----	1, 731, 000	1, 731, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(3, 181, 000)	(3, 050, 000)	(-131, 000)

THE PANAMA CANAL

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

91-50	Operating expenses-----	1, 085, 000	1, 085, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(120, 000)	(120, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued**

II. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-85	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL—Continued			
	The PANAMA CANAL—Continued			
	PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND			
	<i>Limitation on general and administrative expenses</i> -----	(\$130, 000)	(\$130, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves (limitation on expenses)</i> -----	(20, 000)	(20, 000)	-----
	Total, The Panama Canal-----	1, 085, 000	1, 085, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(120, 000)	(120, 000)	-----
	<i>Limitation on general and administrative expenses</i> -----	(130, 000)	(130, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves (limitation on expenses)</i> -----	(20, 000)	(20, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of Defense—Civil:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	2, 816, 000	2, 816, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(3, 321, 000)	(3, 190, 000)	(—\$131, 000)
	<i>Limitation on general and administrative expenses</i> -----	(130, 000)	(130, 000)	-----

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

91-50 Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)----- (1, 589, 000) -----
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (835, 000) -----

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

91-50 School assistance in federally affected areas (*by transfer*)----- (16, 000) -----
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (12, 000) -----
91-50 Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)----- (694, 000) -----
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (1, 123, 000) -----
91-50 Civil rights educational activities (*by transfer*)----- (67, 000) -----

Total, Office of Education:

By transfer----- (777, 000)
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (1, 135, 000)

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

91-50 Salaries and expenses (*by transfer*)----- (307, 000) -----
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (80, 000) -----

HEALTH MANPOWER

91-85 Health manpower education and utilization (*release of P.L. 90-364 reserves*)----- (201, 000) -----
91-85 Dental health activities (*release of P.L. 90-364 reserves*)----- (102, 000) -----
Total, Health manpower (*release of P.L. 90-364 reserves*)----- (303, 000) -----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued			
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—Continued			
	DISEASE PREVENTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL			
91-50	Chronic diseases (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(\$436,000)	(\$436,000)	-----
	Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves -----	(130,000)	(130,000)	-----
91-50 and 91-85	Air pollution (<i>release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i>) -----	(519,000)	(519,000)	-----
91-50	Urban and industrial health (<i>release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i>) -----	(492,000)	(492,000)	-----
91-50	Radiological health (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(407,000)	(407,000)	-----
	Total, disease prevention and environmental control:			
	By transfer -----	(843,000)	(843,000)	-----
	Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves -----	(1,141,000)	(1,141,000)	-----

HEALTH SERVICES		
91-85	Community health services (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(590, 000)
91-85	Patient care and special health services (<i>by transfer</i>):-----	(1, 993, 000)
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(91, 000)
91-85	Hospital construction activities (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(169, 000)
91-50	Indian health activities (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves and transfer hereto</i>)-----	(2, 640, 000)
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(214, 000)
	Total, health services:	
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(1, 993, 000)
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(3, 704, 000)
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH		
91-50	Biologics standards (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(114, 000)
91-50	Regional medical programs (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(67, 000)
91-50	Environmental health sciences (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(137, 000)
	Total, National Institutes of Health (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(318, 000)

(—\$200, 000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued			
	Public Health Service—Continued			
	NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH			
91-50	Mental health research and services (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(\$401,000)	(\$401,000)	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(801,000)	(801,000)	-----
91-50	Saint Elizabeths Hospital, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(1,984,000)	(1,984,000)	-----
	Total National Institute of Mental Health:			
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(2,385,000)	(2,385,000)	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(801,000)	(801,000)	-----
	OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE			
91-50	National health statistics (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(271,000)	(271,000)	-----
91-50	National Library of Medicine (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(162,000)	(162,000)	-----
	Total, other Public Health Service (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 re- serves</i>)-----	(433,000)	(433,000)	-----

Total, Public Health Service				
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(5, 728, 000)	(5, 528, 000)	(- \$200, 000)
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(6, 780, 000)	(6, 780, 000)	-----
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(1, 234, 000)	(1, 234, 000)	-----
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	<i>Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)</i> -----	(18, 147, 000)	(18, 147, 000)	-----
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS			
91-50	Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(56, 000)	(56, 000)	-----
91-50	Howard University, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(401, 000)	(401, 000)	-----
91-50	Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(291, 000)	(291, 000)	-----
	Total, special institutions (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(748, 000)	(748, 000)	-----
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(216, 000)	(216, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(232, 000)	(232, 000)	-----
91-50	Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(215, 000)	(215, 000)	-----
91-50	Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(458, 000)	(458, 000)	-----
91-50	Office of Administration, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(233, 000)	(233, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(10, 000)	(10, 000)	-----
91-50	Surplus property utilization (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(57, 000)	(57, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-50	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued			
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY—Continued			
	Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(\$56, 000)	(\$56, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(61, 000)	(61, 000)	-----
	Total, Office of the Secretary:			
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(777, 000)	(777, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(761, 000)	(761, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:			
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(9, 511, 000)	(9, 511, 000)	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(10, 853, 000)	(10, 653, 000)	(--\$200, 000)
	<i>Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)</i> -----	(18, 147, 000)	(18, 147, 000)	-----
91-50	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE			
	Salaries and expenses -----	1, 407, 000	1, 407, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(387, 000)	(387, 000)	-----

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

91-85 91-50	Salaries and expenses----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	280, 000 (73, 000)	280, 000 (73, 000)
	DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS		
91-50	Salaries and expenses----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> ----- <i>By transfer</i> ----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	66, 000 (34, 000) (137, 000) (15, 000)	66, 000 (34, 000) (137, 000) (15, 000)
91-50	Urban research and technology (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)----- Total, Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> ----- <i>By transfer</i> -----	(6, 000) 66, 000 (55, 000) (137, 000)	(6, 000) 66, 000 (55, 000) (137, 000)
	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT		
91-50	General administration----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	230, 000 (51, 000)	230, 000 (51, 000)
91-50	Regional management and services----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> ----- Total, Departmental management----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	278, 000 (80, 000) 508, 000 (131, 000)	278, 000 (80, 000) 508, 000 (131, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
91-85	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued			
	MORTGAGE CREDIT			
	Federal Housing Administration:			
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(\$465, 000)	(\$465, 000)	-----
	<i>Limitation on nonadministrative expenses</i>	(2, 000, 000)	(1, 000, 000)	(--\$1, 000, 000)
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	2, 261, 000	2, 261, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(646, 000)	(646, 000)	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(137, 000)	(137, 000)	-----
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(465, 000)	(465, 000)	-----
91-50	<i>Limitation on nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(2, 000, 000)	(1, 000, 000)	(--1, 000, 000)
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS			
	Education and welfare services-----	2, 843, 000	2, 843, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(415, 000)	(415, 000)	-----

91-50	Construction (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(39, 000)	(39, 000)	-----
91-50	Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(38, 000)	(38, 000)	-----
91-50	General administrative expenses (by transfer)-----	(246, 000)	(246, 000)	-----
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Indian irrigation systems (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(117, 000)	(117, 000)	-----
91-50	Power systems, Indian irrigation projects (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(39, 000)	(39, 000)	-----
91-50	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, schools, etc. (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(40, 000)	(40, 000)	-----
91-50	Tribal funds (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(48, 000)	(48, 000)	-----
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs-----	2, 843, 000	2, 843, 000	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(736, 000)	(736, 000)	-----
	By transfer-----	(246, 000)	(246, 000)	-----
	BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	175, 000	175, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF MINES			
91-50	Conservation and development of mineral resources-----	750, 000	750, 000	+ 750, 000
	(By transfer)-----	(1, 183, 000)	(433, 000)	(- 750, 000)
91-50	Health and safety (by transfer)-----	(347, 000)	(347, 000)	-----
91-50	General administrative expenses (by transfer)-----	(70, 000)	(70, 000)	-----
	Total, Bureau of Mines-----	750, 000	750, 000	+ 750, 000
	(By transfer)-----	(1, 600, 000)	(850, 000)	(- 750, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued			
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES			
91-94	Management and investigations of resources-----	\$628, 000	\$628, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(59, 000)	(59, 000)	-----
91-50	Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development-----	8, 000	8, 000	-----
91-50	Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation-----	7, 000	7, 000	-----
91-50	General administrative expenses-----	45, 000	45, 000	-----
91-50	Administration of Pribilof Islands-----	20, 000	20, 000	-----
91-50	Promote and develop fishery products and research pertaining to American fisheries (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(10, 000)	(10, 000)	-----
91-50	Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund (<i>increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>)-----	(13, 000)	(13, 000)	-----
	Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries -----	708, 000	708, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(69, 000)	(69, 000)	-----

	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(13, 000)	(13, 000)	-----
	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE			
91-94	Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves and transfer hereto</i>)-----	(9, 000)	(9, 000)	-----
91-94	General administrative expenses-----	78, 000	78, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> -----	(4, 000)	(4, 000)	-----
	Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife-----	78, 000	78, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(13, 000)	(13, 000)	-----
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE			
91-94	Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities-----	668, 000	668, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(115, 000)	(115, 000)	-----
91-50	General administrative expenses-----	186, 000	186, 000	-----
91-50	Preservation of historic properties-----	21, 000	21, 000	-----
	Total, National Park Service-----	875, 000	875, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(115, 000)	(115, 000)	-----
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION			
91-50	General investigations-----	371, 000	371, 000	-----
91-50	Operation and maintenance-----	787, 000	630, 000	--157, 000
91-50	General administrative expenses-----	503, 000	450, 000	--53, 000
	Total, Bureau of Reclamation-----	1, 661, 000	1, 451, 000	--210, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued			
	BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Construction (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(\$998, 000)	(\$998, 000)	-----
91-50	Operation and maintenance (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(643, 000)	(643, 000)	-----
91-50	Construction of electric transmission lines and substations, contribu- tions, Bonneville Power Project (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(1, 000)	(1, 000)	-----
	Total, Bonneville Power Administration (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(1, 642, 000)	(1, 642, 000)	-----
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	298, 000	298, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	454, 000	454, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	31, 000	31, 000	-----
	Total, Department of the Interior:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	7, 123, 000	7, 663, 000	+ \$540, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(2, 575, 000)	(2, 575, 000)	-----

	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(1, 846, 000)	(1, 096, 000)	(-750, 000)
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(13, 000)	(13, 000)	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(88, 000)	(88, 000)	-----
	FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	9, 220, 000	9, 220, 000	-----
	IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE			
91-98	Salaries and expenses-----	3, 276, 000	3, 276, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(270, 000)	(270, 000)	-----
	LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(57, 000)	(57, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of Justice:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	12, 496, 000	12, 496, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(415, 000)	(415, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Manpower development and training activities, salaries and expenses (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(\$92, 000)	(\$92, 000)	-----
91-94	Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(\$13, 000)	(\$13, 000)	-----
91-50	Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses: <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> ----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> ----- Total, Manpower Administration (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(50, 000) (363, 000) (818, 000)	(50, 000) (363, 000) (818, 000)	----- ----- -----
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY			
91-50	Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses: (<i>Increase in amount available for administrative expenses</i>)----- <i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(865, 000) (125, 000)	(865, 000) (125, 000)	----- -----
	LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS			
91-50	Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(448, 000)	(448, 000)	-----

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS		
91-50	Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses:	
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(120, 000)-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> -----	(152, 000)-----
91-50	Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(992, 000)-----
	Total, Wage and Labor Standards (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(1, 264, 000)-----
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS		
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	93, 000-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(700, 000)-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> -----	(87, 000)-----
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS		
91-50	Salaries and expenses:	
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(60, 000)-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> -----	(14, 000)-----
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR		
91-50	Salaries and expenses:	
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(200, 000)-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> -----	(21, 000)-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued			
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
91-50	Salaries and expenses:			
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(\$110,000)	(\$110,000)	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> -----	(121,000)	(121,000)	-----
	OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM			
91-50	Salaries and expenses:			
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(3,000)	(3,000)	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i> -----	(39,000)	(39,000)	-----
	Total, Department of Labor:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	93,000	93,000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(4,010,000)	(4,010,000)	-----
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(865,000)	(865,000)	-----
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT			
	(OUT OF POSTAL FUND)			
91-50	Administration and regional operations-----	3,304,000	-----	-\$3,304,000
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(2,107,000)	(2,107,000)	-----

91-50	Research, development, and engineering-----	500, 000	500, 000	-----
91-50	Operations-----	191, 300, 000	195, 071, 000	+3, 771, 000
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(54, 000, 000)	(62, 000, 000)	(+8, 000, 000)
91-50	Supplies and services-----	467, 000	-----	--467, 000
	Total, Post Office Department:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	195, 571, 000	195, 571, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(2, 107, 000)	(2, 107, 000)	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(54, 000, 000)	(62, 000, 000)	(+8, 000, 000)
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	6, 787, 000	6, 787, 000	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(833, 000)	(833, 000)	-----
	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES			
91-94	Missions to international organizations-----	153, 000	153, 000	-----
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS			
91-50	International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:			
	Salaries and expenses-----	43, 000	43, 000	-----
	Operation and maintenance-----	29, 000	29, 000	-----
91-50	American sections, international commissions-----	19, 000	19, 000	-----
	Total, international commissions-----	91, 000	91, 000	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued			
	EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE			
91-50	Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities-----	\$425, 000	\$425, 000	-----
	OTHER			
91-50	Migration and refugee assistance-----	26, 000	26, 000	-----
	Total, Department of State:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	7, 482, 000	7, 482, 000	-----
	By transfer-----	(833, 000)	(833, 000)	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	445, 000	100, 000	-\$345, 000
	COAST GUARD			
91-50	Operating expenses-----	10, 000, 000	9, 500, 000	--500, 000
	Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves-----	(82, 000)	(82, 000)	-----

91-50	Acquisition, construction, and improvements (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(51, 000)	(51, 000)	-----
91-50	Reserve training-----	1, 000, 000	900, 000	- 100, 000
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(40, 000)	(40, 000)	-----
	Total, Coast Guard-----	11, 000, 000	10, 400, 000	- 600, 000
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(173, 000)	(173, 000)	-----
	FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Operations-----	30, 800, 000	30, 400, 000	- 400, 000
91-50	Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports-----	254, 000	220, 000	- 34, 000
	Total, Federal Aviation Administration-----	31, 054, 000	30, 620, 000	- 434, 000
	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Highway beautification-----	64, 000	64, 000	-----
91-50	Traffic and highway safety (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(210, 000)	-----	(- 210, 000)
91-50	Motor carrier safety-----	68, 000	68, 000	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(22, 000)	(22, 000)	-----
91-50	Limitation on general expenses:			
	Increase in limitation on administrative expenses-----	(1, 875, 000)	(875, 000)	(- 1, 000, 000)
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(641, 000)	(641, 000)	-----
	Total, Federal Highway Administration-----	132, 000	132, 000	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserve-----	(873, 000)	(663, 000)	(- 210, 000)
	Limitation on administrative expenses-----	(1, 875, 000)	(875, 000)	(- 1, 000, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued			
	FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(\$35, 000)	(\$35, 000)	-----
91-50	Bureau of railroad safety-----	140, 000	90, 000	-\$50, 000
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(39, 000)	(83, 000)	(+ 44, 000)
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration-----	140, 000	90, 000	-\$50, 000
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(74, 000)	(118, 000)	(+ 44, 000)
	URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	31, 000	-----	-31, 000
	Total, Department of Transportation:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	42, 802, 000	41, 342, 000	-1, 460, 000
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(1, 120, 000)	(954, 000)	(-166, 000)
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(1, 875, 000)	(875, 000)	(-1, 000, 000)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

91-85 Salaries and expenses----- 257, 000 257, 000 -----
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (134, 000) (134, 000) -----

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

91-50 Salaries and expenses----- 2, 637, 000 2, 637, 000 -----
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (1, 550, 000) (1, 550, 000) -----

BUREAU OF THE MINT

91-50 Salaries and expenses----- 630, 000 500, 000 -----
 ----- -130, 000 -----

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

91-85 Salaries and expenses----- 450, 000 425, 000 -----
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (564, 000) (564, 000) -----

91-50 Revenue accounting and processing----- 5, 592, 000 4, 500, 000 -----
 ----- -1, 092, 000 -----

91-85 Compliance----- 3, 300, 000 2, 800, 000 -----
Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (20, 360, 000) (20, 360, 000) -----

Total, Internal Revenue Service----- 9, 342, 000 7, 725, 000 -----
 ----- -1, 617, 000 -----

Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves----- (20, 924, 000) (20, 924, 000) -----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

II. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT—Continued			
	OFFICE OF THE TREASURER			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	\$167, 000	\$167, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(85, 000)	(85, 000)	-----
	UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	1, 338, 000	1, 338, 000	-----
	Total, Treasury Department:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	14, 371, 000	12, 624, 000	-\$1, 747, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(22, 693, 000)	(22, 693, 000)	-----
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service-----	3, 671, 000	3, 671, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(677, 000)	(677, 000)	-----
91-94	Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service-----	300, 000	300, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(95, 000)	(95, 000)	-----
91-50	Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(5, 000)	(5, 000)	-----

91-50	Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(38, 000)	(38, 000)	-----
91-94	Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator-----	119, 000	119, 000	-----
91-50	Administrative operations fund (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(107, 000)	(107, 000)	-----
	Total, General Services Administration:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	4, 090, 000	4, 090, 000	-----
	Release P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(922, 000)	(922, 000)	-----
	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
91-50	Medical and prosthetic research-----	1, 168, 000	1, 168, 000	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(362, 000)	(362, 000)	-----
91-50	Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses-----	589, 000	589, 000	-----
	Total, Veterans Administration: New budget (obligational) authority-----	1, 757, 000	1, 757, 000	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(362, 000)	(362, 000)	-----
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
91-50	American Battle Monuments Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	33, 000	33, 000	-----
91-50	Arms Control and Disarmament Agency: Arms control and disarma- ment activities (release of P.L. 90-364 reserves)-----	(15, 000)	(15, 000)	-----
91-50	Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses-----	500, 000	500, 000	-----
91-94	Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	1, 364, 000	1, 364, 000	-----
	Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves-----	(89, 000)	(89, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued			
91-50	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Salaries and expenses	\$370, 000	\$370, 000	-----
91-50	Export-Import Bank: <i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(172, 000)	-----	(-- \$172, 000)
91-85	Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses: <i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(97, 000)	(97, 000)	-----
91-94	Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses	970, 000	970, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i>	(16, 000)	(16, 000)	-----
91-50	Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses: <i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(115, 000)	(115, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i>	(102, 000)	(102, 000)	-----
91-94	Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses	90, 000	90, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P. L. 90-364 reserves</i>	(76, 000)	(76, 000)	-----

91-50	Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses-----	125, 000	125, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(8, 000)	(8, 000)	-----
91-50	Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	778, 000	778, 000	-----
91-50	Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	32, 000	32, 000	-----
91-50	Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	818, 000	818, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(382, 000)	(382, 000)	-----
91-50	National Capital Planning Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	30, 000	30, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(20, 000)	(20, 000)	-----
91-50	National Commission on Product Safety: Salaries and expenses-----	25, 000	25, 000	-----
91-85	National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses-----	400, 000	250, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(848, 000)	—150, 000	-----
91-50	Railroad Retirement Board: Limitation on salaries and expenses (<i>increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>)-----	(516, 000)	(516, 000)	-----
91-50	Renegotiation Board: Salaries and expenses-----	140, 000	140, 000	-----
91-94	Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	694, 000	594, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(199, 000)	(+100, 000)	-----
91-50	Small Business Administration: Salaries and expenses-----	418, 000	200, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(265, 000)	(265, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued			
91-50	Smithsonian Institution:			
	Salaries and expenses-----	\$695, 000	\$695, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(125, 000)	(125, 000)	-----
91-94	Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art-----	30, 000	30, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(23, 000)	(23, 000)	-----
	Total, Smithsonian Institution-----	725, 000	725, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(148, 000)	(148, 000)	-----
91-85	Tariff Commission: Salaries and expenses (<i>release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i>)-----	(53, 000)	(53, 000)	-----
91-94	Tax Court of the United States: Salaries and expenses-----	86, 000	86, 000	-----
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(77, 000)	(77, 000)	-----
91-94	United States Information Agency: Salaries and expenses-----	3, 500, 000	3, 500, 000	-----
	Total, other independent agencies: New budget (obligational) authority-----	11, 098, 000	10, 630, 000	--\$468, 000
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(2, 298, 000)	(2, 398, 000)	(+100, 000)
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(900, 000)	(728, 000)	(--172, 000)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

91-50	<i>Parks and recreation</i> -----	(392, 000)	(322, 000)	(-70, 000)
91-50	<i>Health and welfare</i> -----	(2, 437, 000)	(2, 437, 000)	-----
91-50	<i>Highways and traffic</i> -----	(203, 000)	(163, 000)	(-40, 000)
91-50	<i>Sanitary engineering</i> -----	(227, 000)	(227, 000)	-----
91-50	<i>Personal services, wage-board employees</i> -----	(3, 179, 000)	(3, 179, 000)	-----
	<i>Total, District of Columbia</i> -----	(6, 438, 000)	(6, 328, 000)	(-110, 000)

Total, title III:

	<i>New budget (obligational) authority</i> -----	1, 461, 455, 794	1, 183, 298, 454	-278, 157, 340
	<i>Release of P.L. 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(61, 974, 000)	(62, 277, 000)	(+303, 000)
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(75, 233, 000)	(81, 676, 000)	(+6, 443, 000)
	<i>Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(24, 395, 000)	(22, 223, 000)	(-2, 172, 000)

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

The committee has included a provision in the bill that would place an overall ceiling on budget expenditures during the fiscal year 1970 that begins on July 1, 1969. The precise terminology is "Expenditures and net lending"—which, taken together, constitute "budget outlays".

The amount specifically stated in the provision, \$192,900,000,000, is a beginning figure, not an ending figure. It is the revised projection of 1970 budget outlays announced by the President on April 12 and summarized in the Review of the 1970 Budget released on April 15. That summary appears in the Congressional Record of April 16, 1969, at pages E2993-2996.

Coupled to the \$192.9 billion figure is language providing—

** * * That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.*

In other words, Congress would work from the President's proposed total spending estimate. It would do so through its actions, or its inactions, on requests for appropriations and other budget obligational authority and outlay proposals in the various appropriation bills and certain other bills affecting the budget.

The language would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with the estimated expenditure effect of specific congressional actions or inactions having budgetary impact.

It is a flexible provision—but in terms of aggregate spending, flexible only on the action of the Congress, not the Executive.

It does not seek to declare something of the end from the beginning; it sets a beginning point against which Congress would work in deciding, through its various spending actions, what the ultimate total should be, and supplies a mechanism for resetting the ceiling accordingly.

Unlike last year's ceiling provision, it does not impose an arbitrary broad-axe type ceiling cutback that would leave to the Executive the allocation of any congressional expenditure reduction to specific agencies and programs.

It would be the first ceiling ever to place directly in the hands of Congress the specific decision as to the maximum amount to be taken out of the Treasury for payment of the Government's bills in a given 12-month period.

POTENTIAL REDUCTIONS AND COMPARISON TO LAST YEAR'S CEILING

It is a rigid ceiling; it cannot be exceeded except upon action by the Congress. And as indicated above, the ceiling would decrease if congressional actions on the budget so provide.

It lays the basis for potentially very significant retrenchment in expenditures. If such a ceiling had been adopted—and strictly adhered to—over the last many years, billions of expenditures would have been avoided.

More specifically, taking all 14 budgets for the post-Korea fiscal years 1955 through 1968, the projected expenditure totals in the original annual budgets were cumulatively exceeded by about \$50 billion. In 11 of the 14 years, the overruns aggregated \$53.3 billion. In 3 years, there were underruns aggregating \$3.5 billion. But overall for the 14 years, the government actually expended—for a variety of reasons—about \$50 billion more than the sum total of what was projected in the original budgets. That averages to about \$3.4 billion a year. So the potential is great, if the ceiling is adopted and adhered to.

Unlike the expenditure ceiling provisions enacted in the last session applicable to fiscal 1969, nothing would be exempt from the ceiling. Last year's ceiling provisions had a very significant impact on government spending in fiscal 1969. They significantly restrained the growth of spending that undoubtedly would have otherwise occurred. And on the latest figures, it seems beyond reasonable debate that in the absence of the ceiling provisions, a much needed budget surplus for 1969 would not now be in prospect. But even with the ceiling and the \$6 billion cutback Congress did not, by its actions, diminish the originally projected budget expenditure (outlay) total of \$186.1 billion. It did prevent that total from being exceeded. And it did restrain growth of spending.

More specifically, Congress exempted 50%—\$92.6 billion—of the \$186.1 billion from the \$6 billion cutback, and expressly permitted overruns to the extent determined necessary in the exempted programs. Those overruns were reestimated in the April 15 budget review at \$6.1 billion. The overruns in exempted areas wiped out the \$6 billion cutback in non-exempt areas.

In its specific actions on the individual appropriation and other spending bills, Congress last year contributed roughly \$3.7 to \$3.9 billion (depending on variable calculations) to the \$6 billion overall cutback, leaving the remainder to be allocated by the Executive. The April 15 Review reflects a total cutback of \$7.3 billion from the original estimates for non-exempted areas. Offsetting this gross cutback are the \$6.1 billion overruns in exempted areas leaving a net estimated cutback, as of April 15 of \$1.2 billion from the originally projected total.

Thus the latest estimate of spending for 1969 is \$184.9 billion, \$1.2 billion less than the \$186.1 billion projected in the original 1969 budget. But it should be noted that about \$1.5 billion of the \$7.3 billion reduction now shown in non-exempted areas is not a cut in the more conventional sense, but rather financing adjustments because the Banks for Cooperatives, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, and the Federal National Mortgage Association secondary market operations, which were in the original \$186.1 billion budget total, subsequently became 100% privately owned and thus dropped from the Federal totals.

Of course, the \$7.3 billion reduction figure is a composite of the specific congressional actions, the financing adjustments, actual curtailments of outlays, and administrative reestimates of expenditures—both up and down—in many items as conditions changed. There are signs that further reestimates upward in certain programs will substantially diminish the \$7.3 billion figure and thus in turn the \$1.2 billion figure.

The ceiling proposed in this bill would afford opportunity for maximum flexibility within the overall total to meet, as fully as reasonably possible, changed and changing expenditure requirements in certain specific programs that cannot be foreseen with great precision. The new administration has variously indicated that it intends to seek, on a continuing basis, economies in operations and to look for lower-priority areas when it needs room for increases within its stated policy of strict fiscal restraint. An aggregate ceiling would be facilitating in this regard.

Of course, the President can seek supplemental relief to meet necessary but unforeseen and unavoidable outlay increases which he finds cannot be accommodated within the overall total.

Setting a beginning ceiling in this fashion should in no way discourage the Executive Branch from its continuing commitment—and responsibility—for seeking to conduct the day-to-day management of government programs at the very minimum cost consistent with the public necessities, refraining from spending every dollar that can reasonably be saved. Constructive economy in public spending is not only a matter of legislative decision. It is also a matter of administration. The new administration has attached high priority to quality of performance in administering the government. Wasteful and needless expenditures often do not become so until funds are poorly managed. The primary burden of getting a dollar's value for every dollar justifiably appropriated to the purposes of government lies mainly with those who administer, not with those who legislate.

THE ARITHMETIC AND MECHANICS OF THE CEILING

The ceiling begins by legislating a *net* reduction of \$2,372,000,000 in budget outlays projected for 1970 in the original (January) budget—from \$195.3 billion down to the \$192.9 billion April 15 revised projection of the present administration. But the *gross* ceiling reduction is \$4,020,000,000; this was offset by \$1.6 billion in the recent budget review by upward “corrections” in several specific projections in the original budget.

The \$4 billion cutback in outlays includes \$1.1 billion in defense, \$1 billion for a modification of the previously proposed \$1.6 billion increase in social security benefits, and \$1.9 billion for programs affecting almost every Federal agency.

In the April 15 review in which the \$4 billion cutback in outlays was projected the administration also proposed *gross* cutbacks of \$5.5 billion (\$4.2 billion, net after the “correcting” adjustments of \$1.3 billion) in appropriation and other budget obligational authority requests. \$3 billion of this is in defense and \$2.5 billion in all other areas of the budget. Budget obligational authority (appropriations, essentially) is the traditional basis on which appropriation and authorization bills are stated and voted on regardless of the year or

years in which the funds are to be actually disbursed in the form of budget outlays.

The gross total for new budget authority for 1970 in the January budget is \$210.1 billion, and in the April 15 revision, \$205.9 billion—including so-called permanent budget authority, such as interest, trust funds, etc., which does not actually appear in the annual bills.

The Committee on Appropriations and several other committees have before them for consideration these revised appropriation requests and other budgetary recommendations for fiscal 1970. What Congress does in the bills dealing with these various budget authority proposals plus a handful of other proposals involving outlays but not budget authority basically determines what happens to the \$192.9 billion beginning ceiling in the accompanying bill.

For example, net reductions made through the appropriation bills would translate into net downward adjustments to the \$192.9 billion figure. And in this general connection, some \$38 billion of the appropriation budget requests are first subject to processing through the various annual authorization bills.

In the area of proposed legislation for which the outlay budget includes specific sums, several have the effect of holding the outlay total lower than it otherwise would be. Several, of course, involve additional outlays. For example, if Congress does not enact the proposed postal rate increase, the outlay ceiling, according to the latest estimate available, would be adjusted *upward* by some \$600 million. This is because postal revenues are counted as offsets to expenditures, not as budget receipts.

If the budget proposal to authorize the Farmers Home Administration to make insured rather than direct operating loans is not enacted, the outlay ceiling, according to the budget, would be adjusted *upward* by \$292 million.

If the budget proposal for legislation to restrict public assistance medical aid for patients in mental institutions to 120 days is not enacted, the outlay ceiling, according to the budget, would be adjusted *upward* by \$126 million.

Several legislative proposals designed to diminish budget outlays by the Veterans Administration are priced in the outlay total to save some \$288 million in 1970. Failure of those, according to the budget figures, would be the basis for an equivalent *upward* adjustment in the ceiling.

These four examples aggregate \$1.3 billion. On the other hand, again for example, if the President's proposal for social security benefit increases is not enacted, the \$600 million (of the original budget amount of \$1.6 billion) in the revised budget outlay figure would not now be needed for that purpose, in which case the outlay ceiling would *drop* by \$600 million.

As to the mechanics for adjusting the ceiling, timeliness in accommodating government programs to congressional changes is essential to orderly administration. Congress will be processing budgetary recommendations in many different bills, passing through various legislative stages over a period of several months—virtually all after the fiscal year begins. And it seems essential in the interest of consistency and otherwise to center responsibility in one place for at least tentative determination of congressional action impact.

The Director of the Budget is probably in the best position to make such determinations. The monthly reports submitted by the Director

under subsection (b) of the ceiling provision can be evaluated currently. They can be checked for consistency and reasonableness with tentative estimates frequently made through the budget "score-keeping" reports of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures and with those of the Committees on Appropriations. Amendatory action can be taken if that seems to be necessary in the circumstances.

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES AND THE DIMENSIONS OF ANNUAL ACTIONS

The proposed ceiling provision, being all-inclusive, covers expenditures in fiscal 1970 from budget authority to be newly granted in this session; expenditures from so-called permanent appropriations that flow automatically from earlier laws; and expenditures from unexpended carryover balances of prior years. Very substantial portions of the \$192.9 billion beginning ceiling figure spring from each of these three general sources of expenditure availability.

For example, total unexpended carryover balances at the beginning of fiscal 1970 will approximate \$226 billion—about \$100 billion in social security and other trust funds and \$126 billion in Federal funds. But some \$77 billion of the \$126 billion of Federal funds will have been obligated for programs across the government but not yet actually paid out. The remaining \$49 billion, not obligated and not expended, is in many accounts across the government; there is a comprehensive and informative special analysis of it in the January budget, Special Analysis G, pp. 78-93.

But of the \$226 billion total beginning carryover, trust and federal funds combined, roughly \$86 billion is projected for expenditure (disbursement, that is) in fiscal 1970, and roughly that amount is thus counted in the \$192.9 billion ceiling figure. The remainder—some \$138 billion after a small lapse amount—becomes part of the total unexpended carryover projected into the following year, fiscal 1971.

Roughly then, it can be seen that only about \$107 billion of the newly projected outlay total for 1970 (\$192.9 billion, less the \$86 billion from carryovers) is estimated to come from the \$205.9 billion new budget authority requested or estimated for that same year of 1970. Funds appropriated in a given year are expended partly in that year and partly in subsequent years because of long lead-times, construction time, and other factors.

To put the relationship of budget authority and outlays in some better focus by way of extreme illustration, if the whole \$205 billion of new budget authority for 1970 failed, the expenditure outlay reduction in 1970, based on the budget, would be only \$107 billion. The remainder would be an expenditure avoided in subsequent years.

But to put the picture in sharper focus, it must be noted that Congress does not *annually* act on anywhere near the entire new budget authority total. Some of it is in the form of requests and some of it is in the form of estimates. Roughly \$66 billion, net, of the new budget authority total is estimated to go on the books in 1970 automatically—so-called permanent appropriations—under earlier laws, mainly trust funds, interest on the debt, and several others. The other \$139 billion goes through the annual bill process—mostly the appropriation bills—but it involves projected expenditures, as to 1970, of

roughly only \$90 billion, more or less, which means that *Congress, in the various annual bills, normally deals with new budget authority amounts that, in total, relate to less than half of the budget outlays projected for that same year.* As noted, more than half of budget outlays in a given year now derive from carryover balances and from new budget authority that goes on the books automatically under various permanent appropriation arrangements enacted over the years.

The size of the unexpended carryover pipeline, of course, depends on what is put in and what is taken out. Addition of more new budget authority than is expended in a year increases the pipeline. During fiscal 1970, based on the recent budget projections, the total unexpended pipeline would increase from \$226 billion to \$237 billion, but all of the increase is more than accounted for in trust fund accumulations of balances. In Federal funds, there is a drop of \$1 billion, from \$126 billion to \$125 billion. Depending on congressional actions, this could drop further.

CONTROLLABLE VS UNCONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURES

All expenditures are, of course, controllable by the Congress. All expenditures *are* controlled by Congress, because they flow from laws enacted by Congress. But as a very practical matter, not all are subject to effective discretionary control through the normal *annual* budget and appropriations process.

Very considerable expenditures arise from so-called permanent appropriations that do not pass through the annual appropriation bills. Interest on the debt and trust funds are examples.

Several programs that do pass through the annual bill process involve mandated-type expenditures fixed in basic law, which unless changed through legislation operate as a practical limit on the discretionary power to control them annually. Veterans pensions and public assistance matching grants are examples.

Payments for prior year contracts and obligations falling due cannot effectively be avoided. These run across the whole government.

There are a number of others. The January budget classifies some \$98 billion, or about half of the 1970 outlay budget, as "relatively uncontrollable civilian outlays under present law". The figure for the April 15 budget review under this classification is \$100 billion, meaning that better than half of the outlay budget for the year is not, as a practical matter, subject to the normal discretionary powers of appropriation without changes in the basic laws that more or less ordain them.

Similarly, though the makeup in detail does not exactly correspond, in the \$6 billion cutback provision of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act last session, Congress exempted from the ceiling and from the cutback, programs involving about half of total outlays, in effect recognizing their relative uncontrollability without changes in the basic laws applicable or other compelling circumstances giving rise to them.

Looking at the matter in terms of increases rather than totals, about 75% of the outlay increase, 1970 over 1969, projected in the January budget was in these so-called relatively uncontrollable items. The proportion applicable to the \$8 billion outlay increase, 1970 over 1969, projected in the new administration's budget review is even greater.

The outlay ceiling proposed by the committee for 1970, while rigid and all-encompassing, does not and cannot of course come to grips with these fundamentals of basic laws. But by covering both controllable and "uncontrollable" outlays, it will focus on the total, and keep it in focus.

It will tend to force attention on possible alternatives and substitutions when upward pressures are exerted on the ceiling.

It will keep the hands of Congress on it.

While there are some grounds for doubt that the outlay (bill-paying) stage of the fiscal process is the most logical or the most effective point at which the Congress should seek to control government spending, an overall ceiling on outlays in a given year has some usefulness as a short-run regulating device, especially when the economic and fiscal situations are under great stress as at present. But there is room for great doubt that such a ceiling can realistically be regarded as an effective long-run control procedure.

As today is the consequence of yesterday, so tomorrow is the consequence of today. Legislative authorizations are the seedbeds of future expenditure growth. Initial authorization of a program or project is the beginning point in the legislative spending process. If the program or project, whatever it may be, is not authorized by the Congress, then no appropriation is in order. But the facts are that virtually every year new programs and projects are authorized, and old programs are often extended and expanded. Seldom are existing programs and activities deauthorized via the basic legislative route. Fiscally, the cumulative result is increasing demands on the Federal Treasury.

In the long range sense as distinguished from any particular fiscal year, too much emphasis is attached to controlling growth of government spending by applying the control at the *end* of the spending process. It is more logically and effectively applicable at the authorization and appropriation stages.

Appropriations are not in order unless there is first a legislative authorization. No funds can be withdrawn from the Treasury but in consequence of valid authority granted by the Congress to first create an obligation in behalf of the Government. That is the key to the situation. The most consistently accurate barometer to future spending levels is the dimensions of budget authority enacted by the Congress to enter into obligations on behalf of the Government.

Authorize something new or enlarge an existing authorization and a request for new obligating authority is almost certain to follow.

Denial of authority to obligate precludes a subsequent expenditure.

Curtail the input of new appropriations (and other forms of obligating authority) and spending will come down.

Grant authority to obligate and the obligation inevitably will follow in due time.

Once the obligation is made and the bill comes due, the check to pay it (the outlay) must also inevitably follow in due time.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 5, in connection with the Department of Defense:

SEC. 201. Deficiencies incurred under the terms of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 11), shall not exceed the amounts of the estimates in House Documents Numbered 91-50 and 91-94, or the amounts provided herein, whichever is lower, for each such authorized purpose.

On page 16, in connection with the Office of the Speaker of the House:

From and after March 1, 1969, the basic annual lump-sum ceiling allowance applicable under this appropriation is hereby increased by \$2,230.

On page 17, in connection with the House office buildings:

From and after March 1, 1969, the compensation of the Superintendent of Garages shall be at the basic annual rate of \$5,270.

On page 61, in connection with a limitation on government outlays:

SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: Provided, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.



Union Calendar No. 84

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

[Report No. 91-252]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 15, 1969

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
5 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second
6 Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

TITLE I

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
Army”, \$110,000,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
Navy”, \$14,500,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
Air Force”, \$115,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
tenance, Army”, \$96,310,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
tenance, Marine Corps”, \$15,390,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
tenance, Air Force”, \$242,700,000.

DISTRIBUTION OF *FLORIDIANUS* AND *MORONE* ADULTS

For an additional amount for “Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army”, \$640,100,000, to remain available until expended.

TABLE II

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses”,
for “Plant and animal disease and pest control”, \$1,400,000.

EXTENSION SERVICE

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses”, for “Retirement and employees’ compensation costs for extension agents”, \$218,000.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION

SERVICE

SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Sugar Act program",
\$7,500,000.

1 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

2 EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

3 There may be transferred to the Emergency Credit Re-
4 volving Fund not to exceed \$25,000,000 of the unobligated
5 funds in the Direct Loan Account, to be reimbursed to the
6 Direct Loan Account from repayments of loans made from
7 the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund.

8 CHAPTER II

9 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

10 MILITARY PERSONNEL

11 RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

12 For an additional amount for “Reserve personnel,
13 Navy”, \$4,150,000.

14 RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

15 For an additional amount for “Reserve personnel, Ma-
16 rine Corps”, \$4,500,000.

17 RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

18 For an additional amount for “Retired pay, Defense”,
19 \$175,000,000.

20 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

21 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

22 For an additional amount for “Operation and mainte-
23 nance, Navy”, \$20,000,000.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

2 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
3 nance, Marine Corps", \$3,600,000.

4 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

5 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
6 nance, Army National Guard", \$10,000,000.

7 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

8 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
9 nance, Air National Guard", \$8,800,000.

10 GENERAL PROVISION

11 SEC. 201. Deficiencies incurred under the terms of sec-
12 tion 3732 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C.
13 11), shall not exceed the amounts of the estimates in House
14 Documents Numbered 91-50 and 91-94, or the amounts
15 provided herein, whichever is lower, for each such author-
16 ized purpose.

17 CHAPTER III

18 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

19 FEDERAL FUNDS

20 FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

21 For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the
22 District of Columbia", for the general fund of the District
23 of Columbia, \$10,365,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$975,000, of which \$1,000 shall be payable from the highway fund.

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", \$10,034,000, of which \$528,000 shall be payable from the highway fund, and of which \$1,302,000 shall be available for the fiscal year 1968.

EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Education", \$13,931,000.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

For an additional amount for "Health and welfare", \$111,000.

SANITARY ENGINEERING

For an additional amount for "Sanitary engineering", \$252,000.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For payment of claims in excess of \$250, approved by the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$50,000.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated herein for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

For an additional amount for "Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$2,700,000, and, in addition, \$35,000 which shall be derived by transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER V

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, telecommunications", \$500,000, to remain available until expended.

1 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

2 DISASTER RELIEF

3 For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", \$35,-
4 000,000, to remain available until expended.

5 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

6 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
9 \$600,000; (and release of \$81,000 reserved under this
10 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
11 364).

12 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
15 \$2,573,000.

16 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

17 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

18 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
19 sions", \$179,000,000, to remain available until expended.

20 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

21 For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits",
22 \$14,200,000, to remain available until expended.

23 MEDICAL CARE

24 For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$46,189,-
25 000: (and release of \$15,167,000 reserved under this ap-
26 propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “General operating expenses”, \$12,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

DEVELOPMENT

MORTGAGE CREDIT

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat. 477), is increased by \$40,000,000 and the limitation on total payments under those entered into under section 236 of such Act (82 Stat. 498) is increased by \$40,000,000.

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

COLLEGE HOUSING

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with educational institutions entered into pursuant to section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604), is increased by \$2,500,000.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For additional amounts for “Low rent public housing annual contributions”, \$7,168,000 for the fiscal year 1968, and \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$10,410,000; and in addition, \$1,803,000 (including \$175,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Water supply and water pollution control", fiscal year 1969; (and release of \$275,000 reserved under "Management of lands and resources" pursuant to said section 201).

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", \$2,769,000; (and release of \$426,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For a repayable advance to the "Land and water conservation fund", as authorized by section 4 (b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16

1 U.S.C. 4601-7), for liquidation of obligations incurred
2 against such fund pursuant to law, \$19,000,000, to remain
3 available until expended.

4 For an additional amount for "Land and water conser-
5 vation", to be derived from the "Land and water conserva-
6 tion fund" and to remain available until expended for liqui-
7 dation of obligations incurred pursuant to section 3 (b) (1)
8 of the Act of October 2, 1968 (Public Law 90-545), \$19,-
9 000,000.

10 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

11 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

12 For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations,
13 and research", \$2,092,000, of which \$300,000 shall remain
14 available until June 30, 1970.

15 BUREAU OF MINES

16 HELIUM FUND

17 For an additional amount of borrowing authority for
18 the "Helium fund", \$5,000,000, to remain available with-
19 out fiscal year limitation.

20 OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
23 \$48,000.

1 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

2 PAYMENT TO FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND

3 For payment to "Fishermen's Protective Fund", estab-
4 lished pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1968 (82 Stat.
5 729), \$60,000, to remain available until expended.

6 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

7 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

8 For an additional amount for "Management and investi-
9 gations of resources", \$1,353,000; (and release of \$139,000
10 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
11 of Public Law 90-364).

12 CONSTRUCTION

13 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$200,000,
14 to remain available until expended.

15 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

16 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

17 For an additional amount for "Management and pro-
18 tection", \$2,479,000; (and release of \$195,000 reserved
19 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
20 Law 90-364).

1 CONSTRUCTION

2 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$100,000,
3 to remain available until expended.

4 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

5 FOREST SERVICE

6 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

7 For an additional amount for "Forest protection and
8 utilization", as follows: "Forest land management", \$25,-
9 028,000; "Forest research", \$1,564,000; and "State and
10 private forestry cooperation", \$124,000: (and release of
11 \$1,676,000 reserved under "Forest protection and utiliza-
12 tion" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

13 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
14 HUMANITIES

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
17 equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of
18 money, and other property received by each Endowment
19 under the provisions of section 10 (a) (2) of the National
20 Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965,

1 as amended, not to exceed a total of \$3,000,000, to remain
2 available until expended.

3 CHAPTER VII

4 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

5 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

6 UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL

7 EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

8 For an additional amount for "Unemployment com-
9 pensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen",
10 \$20,000,000.

11 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

12 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

13 EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION CLAIMS AND EXPENSES

14 For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation
15 claims and expenses", \$15,900,000.

16 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND

17 WELFARE

18 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

19 HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

20 For an additional amount for "Higher educational ac-
21 tivities", including payments authorized by section 108
22 (b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as
23 amended (Public Law 90-354, approved June 20, 1968),
24 and annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the
25 Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law

1 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), \$11,161,000, of
2 which \$3,920,000 shall remain available until expended for
3 said annual interest grants: *Provided*, That, in addition,
4 \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Community
5 mental health resource support", Public Health Service,
6 fiscal year 1969.

7 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

8 OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

9 COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES

10 For an additional amount for "Comprehensive health
11 planning and services", \$9,186,000, to be derived by trans-
12 fer from "Community mental health resource support",
13 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
14 \$292,000 reserved under "Comprehensive health planning
15 and services" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
16 364): *Provided*, That the amount made available under
17 "Comprehensive health planning and services" in the De-
18 partment of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation
19 Act, 1969, for grants under section 314(a) of the Public
20 Health Service Act is reduced from "\$7,375,000" to
21 \$7,125,000.

22 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

23 For grants and loans pursuant to the District of Columbia
24 Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-
25 457), \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for maintenance payments"; "Grants to States for medical assistance"; and "Social services, administration, training, and demonstration projects"; \$651,546,000.

ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES NATIONALS

For an additional amount for "Assistance for repatriated United States nationals", \$100,000.

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Lelia Ashton Everett, mother of Robert A. Everett, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, \$30,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Speaker: From and after March 1, 1969, the basic annual lump-sum ceiling allowance applicable under this appropriation is hereby increased by \$2,230.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

Miscellaneous items: The limitation under this head, fiscal year 1969, on the payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved Octo-

ber 9, 1940 (Public Law 812), is hereby increased by
\$36,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

House office buildings: From and after March 1, 1969,
the compensation of the Superintendent of Garages shall be
at the basic annual rate of \$5,270.

CHAPTER IX

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
general administration", \$65,000, and, in addition, \$231,-
000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount
reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement
Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public
Law 90-364, and \$2,000 which shall be derived by transfer
from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses,
Community Relations Service", pursuant to said section 201.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
general legal activities", \$1,314,000, and, in addition, \$100,-
000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount
reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement

1 Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public
2 Law 90-364; (and release of \$100,000 reserved under
3 "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities" pursuant to
4 said section 201).

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

6 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
7 Antitrust Division", \$99,000, and, in addition, \$262,000
8 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved
9 under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance
10 Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
11 364; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under "Salaries and
12 expenses, Antitrust Division" pursuant to said section 201).

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS
14 AND MARSHALS

15 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
16 United States attorneys and marshals", \$2,505,000; (and
17 release of \$150,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
18 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

19 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

21 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
22 Bureau of Prisons", \$2,319,000; (and release of \$250,000
23 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
24 of Public Law 90-364).

1 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

2 For an additional amount for "Support of United States
3 Prisoners", \$2,500,000.

4 BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
7 \$1,187,000; (and release of \$400,000 reserved under this
8 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
9 90-364).

10 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

11 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

12 OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

13 The amount required to be advanced from "Operations
14 and administration" to the Small Business Administration
15 during the current fiscal year for the processing of loan appli-
16 cations is hereby reduced to \$1,200,000; (and release of
17 \$116,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
18 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364).

19 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

20 STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

21 For an additional amount for "State marine schools",
22 for liquidation of obligations incurred for payment of allow-
23 ances for uniforms, textbooks and subsistence of cadets at
24 State marine schools, to remain available until expended,

1 \$210,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
2 for "Ship construction".

3 THE JUDICIARY

4 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

5 PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

6 For an additional amount for "Printing and binding
7 Supreme Court reports", \$27,000.

8 For an additional amount for "Printing and binding
9 Supreme Court reports", fiscal year 1968, \$10,000.

10 CUSTOMS COURT

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
13 \$113,000.

14 COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

15 JUDICIAL SERVICES

16 SALARIES OF JUDGES

17 For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges",
18 \$1,975,000.

19 SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

20 For an additional amount for "Salaries of supporting
21 personnel", \$2,412,000.

22 TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

23 For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous
24 expenses", \$400,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount for “Administrative Office of the United States Courts”, \$97,500, and, in addition, \$10,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation “Expenses of referees”, fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses”, \$298,000; (and release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for “Retired pay”, \$2,000,000.

CHAPTER XI

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for “Administering the public debt”, \$1,978,000; (and release of \$334,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

2 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
5 \$107,000.

6 NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
9 \$200,000.

10 CHAPTER XII

11 CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

12 For payment of claims settled and determined by depart-
13 ments and agencies in accord with law and judgments ren-
14 dered against the United States by the United States Court
15 of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in
16 House Document Numbered 101, Ninety-first Congress,
17 \$16,880,812, together with such amounts as may be neces-
18 sary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judg-
19 ments or provided by law) and such additional sums due
20 to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to
21 pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judg-
22 ment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall be-
23 come final and conclusive against the United States by
24 failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided fur-*
25 *ther*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or

1 by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for
2 herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after
3 the date of approval of the Act.

4 TITLE III

5 INCREASED PAY COSTS

6 For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal
7 year 1969, for increased pay costs authorized by or pur-
8 suant to law, as follows:

9 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

10 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

12 Compensation of Members, \$1,975,000;

13 SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

14 "Office of the Speaker", \$4,015;

15 "Office of the Parliamentarian", \$12,935;

16 "Compilation of precedents of House of Representa-
17 tives", \$670;

18 "Office of the Chaplain", \$1,250;

19 "Office of the Clerk", \$110,000;

20 "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$192,000;

21 "Office of the Doorkeeper", \$65,000;

22 "Office of the Postmaster", \$40,875;

23 "Committee employees", \$400,000;

24 Special and minority employees:

- 1 "Minority employees", \$11,410;
- 2 "House Democratic steering committee", \$3,760;
- 3 "House Republican conference", \$3,760;
- 4 "Majority leader", \$4,800;
- 5 "Minority leader", \$4,005;
- 6 "Majority whip", \$3,885;
- 7 "Minority whip", \$3,885;
- 8 "Printing clerks", \$980;
- 9 "Official reporters of debates", \$27,000;
- 10 "Official reporters to committees", \$24,760;
- 11 "Office of the legislative counsel", \$25,600;

12 MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE

- 13 "Members' clerk hire", \$3,050,000;
- 14 Contingent Expenses of the House
- 15 "Special and select committees", \$129,000;
- 16 "Revision of laws", \$1,490;
- 17 "Speaker's automobile", \$665;
- 18 "Majority leader's automobile", \$665;
- 19 "Minority leader's automobile", \$665;

20 JOINT ITEMS

- 21 Contingent Expenses of the Senate
- 22 "Joint Economic Committee", \$13,500;
- 23 "Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", \$17,820;
- 24 "Joint Committee on Printing", \$12,425;
- 25 Contingent Expenses of the House

1 “Joint Committee on Defense Production”, \$7,950;

2 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

3 Office of the Architect of the Capitol: “Salaries”,
4 \$36,000;

5 Capitol buildings and grounds:

6 “Capitol buildings”, \$74,500;

7 “Capitol grounds”, \$25,600;

8 “House office buildings”, \$300,000;

9 “Capitol power plant”, \$27,500;

10 Library buildings and grounds: “Structural and me-
11 chanical care”, \$28,000;

12 BOTANIC GARDEN

13 “Salaries and expenses”, \$22,500;

14 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$579,300: *Provided*, That
16 \$75,000 of the amount allocated for rental of space under
17 this head, fiscal year 1969, may be used for increased pay
18 costs;

19 Copyright Office: “Salaries and expenses”, \$109,800;

20 Legislative Reference Service: “Salaries and expenses”,
21 \$170,000, and in addition, \$50,000 to be derived by trans-
22 fer from the appropriation “Salaries and expenses”, distri-
23 bution of catalog cards;

24 Distribution of catalog cards: Not to exceed \$150,000

1 of the \$200,000 reserve fund under this head, fiscal year
2 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

3 Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presi-
4 dents: "Salaries and expenses", \$6,000;

5 "Collection and distribution of library materials (spe-
6 cial foreign currency program)", \$9,000;

7 GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

8 Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and
9 expenses", \$178,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,-
10 000 of the \$200,000 reserve fund under this head, fiscal
11 year 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

12 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,214,000;

14 THE JUDICIARY

15 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

16 "Salaries", \$120,000;

17 "Care of the building and grounds", \$15,900;

18 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$16,000;

20 COURT OF CLAIMS

21 "Salaries and expenses", \$64,000;

22 COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

23 JUDICIAL SERVICES

24 "Expenses of referees", \$248,000, to be derived from
25 the "Referees' salary and expense fund";

1 “Salaries of referees”, \$404,000, to be derived from the
2 “Referees’ salary and expense fund”;

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

4 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

5 For an additional amount for “Compensation of the
6 President”, \$44,584;

7 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$50,000; (and release of
9 \$355,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
10 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000; (and release of
13 \$70,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
14 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

15 “Salaries and expenses, Telecommunications”; (Release
16 of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
17 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

18 “Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Fed-
19 eral agencies”, \$30,000; (and release of \$40,000 reserved
20 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
21 Law 90-364) ;

22 OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

23 “Salaries and expenses”, (Release of \$28,000 reserved
24 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
25 Law 90-364) ;

1 SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$32,000;

3 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

4 "Administrative expenses", Agency for International
5 Development, \$1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from
6 appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1969;7 "Administrative and other expenses", Department of
8 State, \$75,000, to be derived by transfer from appropria-
9 tions for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1969;

10 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

11 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

12 "Salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$6,615,000 re-
13 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
14 Public Law 90-364) ;

15 COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

16 "Payments and expenses"; (Release of \$81,000 re-
17 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
18 Public Law 90-364) ;

19 FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

20 "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses";
21 (Release of \$135,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
22 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

23 FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$73,000;

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

“Conservation operations”, \$3,980,000; (and release of \$1,000,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Watershed planning”, \$254,000; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“River basin surveys and investigations”, \$306,000; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Watershed works of improvement”, \$688,000; (and release of \$300,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Flood prevention”, \$224,000; (and release of \$128,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Great Plains conservation program”, \$160,000;

“Resource conservation and development”, \$111,000; (and release of \$100,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$684,000;

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$527,000;

1 CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

2 “Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory pro-
3 grams”, \$2,300,000; (and release of \$600,000 reserved
4 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
5 Law 90-364).

6 “Special milk program”; (Release of \$15,000 reserved
7 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
8 Law 90-364) ;

9 FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$362,000, to be derived by
11 transfer from “Cropland adjustment program”, Agricultural
12 Stabilization and Conservation Service, fiscal year 1969;
13 (and release of \$68,000 reserved under “Salaries and ex-
14 penses”, Foreign Agricultural Service, pursuant to section
15 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$65,000;

18 AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION
19 SERVICE

20 “Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation
21 Service”, \$4,108,000 of which \$1,826,000 shall be derived
22 by transfer from “Cropland adjustment program”, fiscal year
23 1969, \$1,560,000, from “Cropland conversion program”,
24 and \$722,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation
25 Fund; (and release of \$551,000 reserved under “Expenses,

1 Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service", pur-
2 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

3 RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$18,000; (and release of
5 \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
6 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$568,000;

9 PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$49,000; (and release of
11 \$64,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
12 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

13 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$239,000;

15 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$58,000;

17 NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$40,000; (and release of
19 \$35,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
20 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

21 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$116,000; (and release of
23 \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
24 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$224,000, of which \$36,000
3 shall be derived by transfer from “Payments and expenses”,
4 Cooperative State Research Service, (and release of
5 \$30,000 reserved under “Salaries and expenses” pursuant
6 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$624,000; (and release of
9 \$11,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
10 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$2,094,000, of which \$13,000
13 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under
14 “Salaries and expenses”, Agricultural Research Service pur-
15 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, \$158,000 from
16 “Payments and expenses”, Cooperative State Research Serv-
17 ice (including \$44,000 from the amount reserved pursuant
18 to said section 201), \$2,000 from the amount reserved
19 under “Cooperative extension work, payments and ex-
20 penses”, Federal Extension Service pursuant to said section
21 201, \$150,000 from “Payments to States and possessions”,
22 Consumer and Marketing Service, and \$412,000 from “Crop-
23 land adjustment program”, Agricultural Stabilization and
24 Conservation Service; (and release of \$156,000 reserved

1 under "Salaries and expenses", Farmers Home Administra-
2 tion pursuant to said section 201) ;

3 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

4 "Administrative and operating expenses", \$274,000;
5 (and release of \$97,000 reserved under this appropriation
6 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

8 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$293,000, of which \$75,000
10 shall be derived by transfer from "Operations and adminis-
11 tration", Economic Development Assistance;

12 OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$75,000, to be derived by
14 transfer from "Operations and administration", Economic
15 Development Assistance; (and release of \$59,000 reserved
16 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
17 Law 90-364) ;

18 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$567,000;

20 "1967 economic censuses", \$285,000;

21 BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$206,000; (and release of
23 \$36,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
24 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$200,000; (and release of
3 \$163,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
4 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 "Export control", \$136,000; (and release of \$60,000
6 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
7 Public Law 90-364) ;

8 OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$142,000; (and release of
10 \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
11 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,254,000; (and release of
14 \$786,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
15 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 "Research and development", \$614,000; (and release
17 of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
18 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

19 PATENT OFFICE

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,240,000; (and release of
21 \$321,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
22 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

2 “Research and technical services”, \$1,100,000;

3 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

4 “Salaries and expenses”, for administrative expenses,
5 \$261,000;

6 “Maritime training”, \$100,000; (and release of \$99,000
7 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
8 Public Law 90-364) ;

9 FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$173,000;

11 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

12 MILITARY PERSONNEL

13 “Military personnel, Army”, \$230,000,000;

14 “Military personnel, Navy”, \$160,000,000;

15 “Military personnel, Marine Corps”, \$45,000,000;

16 “Military personnel, Air Force”, \$214,000,000;

17 “National Guard personnel, Army”, \$13,000,000;

18 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

19 “Operation and maintenance, Army”, \$85,000,000;

20 “Operation and maintenance, Air Force”, \$73,000,000;

21 “Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies”,
22 \$32,000,000;

1 “Court of Military Appeals”, \$18,000;

2 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

3 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

4 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

5 “Operation and maintenance, general”, \$1,731,000, and
6 in addition, \$1,869,000, to be derived by transfer from the
7 amount reserved under “Construction general”, pursuant to
8 section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

9 “General expenses”, \$1,000,000, to be derived by trans-
10 fer from the amount reserved under “Construction, general”,
11 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364.

12 UNITED STATES SOLDIERS’ HOME

13 “Operation and maintenance”; (Release of \$181,000
14 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
15 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 THE PANAMA CANAL

17 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

18 “Operating expenses”, \$1,085,000 (and release of
19 \$120,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
20 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

21 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND

22 “Limitation on general and administrative expenses”,
23 (increase of \$130,000 in the limitation on administrative

1 expenses and release of \$20,000 reserved under this limita-
2 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

3 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
4 WELFARE

5 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,589,000, to be derived by
7 transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Serv-
8 ice, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$835,000 reserved
9 under "Salaries and expenses", Food and Drug Administra-
10 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) :

11 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

12 "School assistance in federally affected areas", \$16,000,
13 to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health
14 resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969:
15 (and release of \$12,000 reserved under "School assistance in
16 federally affected areas" pursuant to section 201 of Public
17 Law 90-364) ;

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$694,000, to be derived by
19 transfer from "Community mental health resource support",
20 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
21 \$1,123,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursu-
22 ant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

23 "Civil rights educational activities", \$67,000, to be

1 derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource
2 support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

3 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

4 OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

5 "Salaries and expenses", \$307,000, to be derived by
6 transfer from "Community mental health resource support",
7 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
8 \$80,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to
9 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

10 HEALTH MANPOWER

11 "Health manpower education and utilization"; (release
12 of \$201,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
13 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

14 "Dental health activities"; (release of \$102,000 re-
15 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
16 Public Law 90-364) ;

17 DISEASE PREVENTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

18 "Chronic diseases", \$436,000, to be derived by transfer
19 from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal
20 year 1969: (and release of \$130,000 reserved under
21 "Chronic diseases" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
22 90-364) ;

23 "Air pollution"; (release of \$519,000 reserved under
24 this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
25 90-364) ;

1 “Urban and industrial health”; (Release of \$492,000
2 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
3 Public Law 90-364) ;

4 “Radiological health”, \$407,000, to be derived by trans-
5 fer from “Community mental health resource support”, Pub-
6 lic Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

7 HEALTH SERVICES

8 “Community health services”; (release of \$590,000
9 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
10 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 “Patient care and special health services”, \$1,993,000,
12 to be derived by transfer from “Communicable diseases”,
13 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
14 \$91,000 reserved under “Patient care and special health
15 services” pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 “Hospital construction activities”; (release of \$169,000
17 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
18 Public Law 90-364) ;

19 “Indian health activities”, \$2,640,000, to be derived
20 by transfer from the amount reserved under “Communicable
21 diseases”, Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of
22 Public Law 90-364: (and release of \$214,000 reserved
23 under “Indian health activities” pursuant to said section
24 201) ;

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

“Biologics standards”; (Release of \$114,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Regional medical programs”; (Release of \$67,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Environmental health sciences”; (Release of \$137,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

“Mental health research and services”, \$401,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$801,000 reserved under “Mental health research and services” pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Salaries and expenses”, \$1,984,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

“National health statistics”; (Release of \$271,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 "National Library of Medicine"; (Release of \$162,000
2 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
3 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

5 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,234,000, to be derived by
6 transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Serv-
7 ice, fiscal year 1969;

8 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

9 "Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)", (In-
10 crease of \$18,147,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and
11 expenses") ;

12 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

13 "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", \$56,000,
14 to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health
15 resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

16 "Howard University, salaries and expenses", \$401,000,
17 to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health
18 resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

19 "Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses", \$291,-
20 000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental
21 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
22 1969;

23 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$216,000, to be derived by
25 transfer from "Community mental health resource support",

1 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
2 \$232,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant
3 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 "Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses",
5 \$215,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community
6 mental health resource support", Public Health Service,
7 fiscal year 1969;

8 "Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses"; (Re-
9 lease of \$458,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant
10 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 "Office of Administration, salaries and expenses", \$233,-
12 000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental
13 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
14 1969: (and release of \$10,000 reserved under "Office of
15 Administration, salaries and expenses" pursuant to section
16 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

17 "Surplus property utilization", \$57,000, to be derived
18 by transfer from "Community mental health resource sup-
19 port", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

20 "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses",
21 \$56,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental
22 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
23 1969: (and release of \$61,000 reserved under "Office of the
24 General Counsel, salaries and expenses" pursuant to section
25 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,407,000; (and release of \$387,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

“Salaries and expenses”, \$280,000; (and release of \$73,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$66,000; and, in addition, \$171,000 (including \$34,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) to be derived by transfer from “Model cities programs”; (and release of \$15,000 reserved on account of “Salaries and expenses”, Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Urban Research and Technology”, (Release of \$6,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

“General administration”, \$230,000; (and release of \$51,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 “Regional management and services”, \$278,000; (and
2 release of \$80,000 reserved on account of this appropriation
3 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 MORTGAGE CREDIT

5 “Limitation on administrative and non-administrative
6 expenses, Federal housing administration”; (Increase of
7 \$465,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and
8 increase of \$1,000,000 in the limitation on non-administra-
9 tive expenses) ;

10 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

11 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

12 “Education and welfare services”, \$2,843,000; (and
13 release of \$415,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
14 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

15 “Construction”, (Release of \$39,000 reserved under this
16 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
17 90-364) ;

18 “Road construction (liquidation of contract authoriza-
19 tion)”, (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this appropri-
20 ation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

21 “General administrative expenses”, \$246,000, to be
22 derived by transfer from “Water supply and water pollution
23 control”, fiscal year 1969;

24 “Operation and maintenance, Indian irrigation systems”;
25 (Release of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
26 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 “Power systems, Indian irrigation projects”; (Release
2 of \$39,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
3 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 “Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, schools,
5 etc.”; (Release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation
6 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 “Tribal funds”; (Release of \$48,000 reserved under this
8 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
9 90-364) ;

10 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

11 “Salaries and expenses”, \$175,000;

12 BUREAU OF MINES

13 “Conservation and development of mineral resources”,
14 \$750,000; and \$433,000, to be derived by transfer from
15 “Solid waste disposal”;

16 “Health and safety”, \$347,000, to be derived by transfer
17 from “Solid waste disposal”;

18 “General administrative expenses”, \$70,000, to be
19 derived by transfer from “Solid waste disposal”;

20 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

21 “Management and investigations of resources”, \$628,-
22 000; (and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropria-
23 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

24 “Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and de-
25 velopment”, \$8,000;

1 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
2 \$7,000;

3 “General administrative expenses”, \$45,000;

4 “Administration of Pribilof Islands”, \$20,000;

5 “Promote and develop fishery products and research
6 pertaining to American fisheries”; (Release of \$10,000
7 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
8 Public Law 90-364) ;

9 “Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan
10 fund”, (Increase of \$13,000 in the limitation on adminis-
11 trative expenses) ;

12 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

13 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
14 \$9,000, which shall be derived by transfer from the amount
15 reserved under “Saline water conversion”, fiscal year 1969,
16 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

17 “General administrative expenses”, \$78,000; and in
18 addition \$4,000 to be derived by transfer from the amount
19 reserved under “Operation and maintenance”, Southwestern
20 Power Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public
21 Law 90-364;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

“Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities”,
\$668,000; (and release of \$115,000 reserved under this ap-
propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“General administrative expenses”, \$186,000;

“Preservation of historic properties”, \$21,000;

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

“General investigations”, \$371,000;

“Operation and maintenance”, \$630,000;

“General administrative expenses”, \$450,000;

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

“Construction”; (Release of \$998,000 reserved under
this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
90-364) ;

“Operation and maintenance”; (Release of \$643,000
reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
Public Law 90-364) ;

“Construction of electric transmission lines and substa-
tions, contributions, Bonneville Power Project”; (Release of
\$1,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$298,000;

3 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4 “Salaries and expenses”, \$454,000;

5 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$31,000;

7 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

8 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

9 “Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service”;

10 (Release of \$88,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
11 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

13 “Salaries and expenses”, \$9,220,000;

14 IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$3,276,000; (and release of
16 \$270,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
17 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

18 LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

19 “Salaries and expenses”; (Release of \$57,000 reserved
20 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
21 Law 90-364) ;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

“Manpower Development and Training Activities”;
(Release of \$92,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses”; (Release of \$313,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses”, \$363,000, of which \$213,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; \$142,000 by transfer from the amount reserved under “Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to said section 201, and \$8,000, by transfer from the amount reserved under “Manpower Development and Training Activities”, pursuant to said section 201; (and release of \$50,000 reserved under “Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to said section 201) ;

“Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and ex-

1 penses", (Increase of \$865,000 in the amount available for
2 administrative expenses and release of \$125,000 reserved
3 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
4 Law 90-364) ;

5 LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

6 "Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries
7 and expenses", (Release of \$448,000 reserved under this
8 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
9 364) ;

10 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

11 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$152,000, of which \$100,000
13 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under
14 "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant
15 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, and \$52,000 by trans-
16 fer from the amount reserved under "Labor Management
17 Services Administration, salaries and expenses", pursuant to
18 section 201 ; (and release of \$120,000 reserved under "Wage
19 and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses",
20 pursuant to said section 201) ;

21 "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses";
22 (Release of \$992,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
23 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

24 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

25 "Salaries and expenses", \$180,000, of which \$87,000
26 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under

1 “Office of the Manpower Administrator, salaries and ex-
2 penses”, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;
3 (and release of \$700,000 reserved under “Bureau of Labor
4 Statistics, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to said section
5 201) ;

6 BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

7 “Salaries and expenses”, \$14,000, to be derived by
8 transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour
9 Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201
10 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$60,000 reserved
11 under “Bureau of International Labor Affairs, salaries and
12 expenses”, pursuant to said section 201) ;

13 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$21,000, to be derived by
15 transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour
16 Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201 of
17 Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$200,000 reserved
18 under “Office of the Solicitor, salaries and expenses”, pur-
19 suant to said section 201) ;

20 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

21 “Salaries and expenses”, \$121,000, to be derived by
22 transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour
23 Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201 of
24 Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$110,000 reserved
25 under “Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses”, pur-
26 suant to said section 201) ;

1 “Federal contract compliance and civil rights program,”
 2 \$39,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved
 3 under “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”,
 4 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release
 5 of \$3,000 reserved under “Federal Contract Compliance
 6 and Civil Rights Program”, pursuant to said section 201) ;

7 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

8 (OUT OF POSTAL FUND)

9 “Administration and regional operations”; (Release
 10 of \$2,107,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant
 11 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 “Research, development, and engineering”, \$500,000;

13 “Operations”, \$195,071,000, and, in addition, \$62,-
 14 000,000 to be derived by transfer from “Transportation”,
 15 fiscal year 1969;

16 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

17 ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

18 “Salaries and expenses”, \$6,787,000, and, in addition,
 19 \$750,000 to be derived by transfer from “Chamizal settle-
 20 ment”, International Boundary and Water Commission,
 21 United States and Mexico, and \$83,000 from “Rama Road,
 22 Nicaragua”;

23 INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

24 “Missions to international organizations”, \$153,000;

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:

“Salaries and expenses”, \$43,000;

“Operation and maintenance”, \$29,000;

“American sections, international commissions”, \$19,000;

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

“Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities”, \$425,000;

OTHER

“Migration and refugee assistance”, \$26,000;

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

COAST GUARD

“Operating expenses”, \$9,500,000; (and release of \$82,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Acquisition, construction and improvements”; (Release of \$51,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Reserve training”, \$900,000; (and release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

2 “Operations”, \$30,400,000;

3 “Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports”,
4 \$220,000;

5 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

6 “Highway beautification”, \$64,000;

7 “Motor carrier safety”, \$68,000; (and release of
8 \$22,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
9 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

10 HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

11 “Limitation on general expenses”, (increase of \$875,000
12 in the limitation on administrative expenses; and
13 release of \$641,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant
14 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

15 FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

16 “Salaries and expenses”; (release of \$35,000 reserved
17 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
18 Law 90-364) ;19 “Bureau of railroad safety”, \$90,000; (and release of
20 \$83,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
21 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

22 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

23 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

24 “Salaries and expenses”, \$257,000; (and release of
25 \$134,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
26 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$2,637,000; (and release of \$1,550,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

BUREAU OF THE MINT

“Salaries and expenses”, \$500,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$425,000; (and release of \$564,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Revenue accounting and processing”, \$4,500,000;

“Compliance”, \$2,800,000; (and release of \$20,360,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

“Salaries and expenses”, \$167,000; (and release of \$85,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,338,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

“Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service”, \$3,671,000; (and release of \$677,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Operating expenses, National Archives and Records

1 Service", \$300,000; (and release of \$95,000 reserved under
2 this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
3 364) ;

4 "Operating expenses, Transportation and Communica-
5 tions Service"; (Release of \$5,000 reserved under this ap-
6 propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 "Operating expenses, Property Management and Dis-
8 posal Service"; (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this
9 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
10 364) ;

11 "Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", \$119,-
12 000;

13 "Administrative operations fund"; (Release of \$107,-
14 000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
15 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

17 "Medical and prosthetic research", \$1,168,000; (and
18 release of \$362,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
19 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

20 "Medical administration and miscellaneous operating ex-
21 penses", \$589,000;

22 OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

23 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$33,000;

1 ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

2 "Arms control and disarmament activities", (Release
3 of \$15,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
4 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;

7 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,364,000; (and release of
9 \$89,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
10 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$370,000;

13 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

14 "Limitation on administrative expenses", (increase of
15 \$97,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

16 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$970,000; (and release of
18 \$16,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
19 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

20 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

21 "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
22 penses", (Increase of \$115,000 in the limitation on adminis-
23 trative expenses and release of \$102,000 reserved under this

1 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90--
2 364) ;

3 FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$90,000; (and release of
5 \$76,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
6 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$125,000; (and release of
9 \$8,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
10 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$778,000;

13 FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$32,000;

15 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$818,000; (and release of
17 \$382,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
18 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

19 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$30,000; (and release of \$20,-
21 000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
22 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

23 NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

1 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$250,000; (and release of
3 \$848,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
4 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

6 "Limitation on salaries and expenses", (Increase of
7 \$516,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

8 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$140,000 ;

10 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$594,000; (and release of
12 \$299,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
13 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

14 SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$200,000; (and release of
16 \$265,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
17 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

18 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$695,000; (and release of
20 \$125,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
21 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

22 "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art",
23 \$30,000; (and release of \$23,000 reserved under this appro-
24 priation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 TARIFF COMMISSION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, (release of \$53,000 reserved
3 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
4 Law 90-364) ;

5 TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$86,000; (and release of
7 \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
8 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

9 UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$3,500,000;

11 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

12 (OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

13 “Parks and recreation”, \$322,000;

14 “Health and welfare”, \$2,437,000;

15 “Highways and traffic”, \$163,000, of which \$140,000
16 shall be payable from the highway fund;

17 “Sanitary engineering”, \$227,000, of which \$99,000
18 shall be payable from the water fund, \$64,000 from the
19 sanitary sewage works fund, and \$1,000 from the metro-
20 politan area sanitary sewage works fund;

21 “Personal services, wage-board employees”, \$3,179,-
22 000, of which \$200,300 shall be payable from the highway
23 fund, \$184,000 from the water fund, \$169,000 from the
24 sanitary sewage works fund, and \$2,000 from the metropoli-
25 tan area sanitary sewage works fund.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET

OUTLAYS

SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first ses-

1 sion of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each
2 calendar quarter thereafter.

3 TITLE V

4 GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in
6 this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the
7 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

8 SEC. 502. Except where specifically increased or de-
9 creased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained
10 within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations
11 or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1969, limiting
12 the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or
13 for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which
14 may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations
15 available for or involving such services, are hereby increased
16 to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized
17 by or pursuant to law.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 11400

[Report No. 91-252]

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for
other purposes.

By Mr. MAHON

MAY 15, 1969

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

INDEX of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 21, 1969
For actions of May 20, 1969
91st 1st No. 82

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	25	Grapes.....	31	REA.....	11
Aging research.....	35	Green Thumb.....	19	Recreation.....	9, 24, 34, 39
Appropriations.....	1, 10	Housing.....	38	Research.....	3, 35, 46
Budget.....	10	Hunger.....	7	Rural housing.....	18
Census.....	27	Inflation.....	26	Rural telephone.....	49
Civil rights.....	4	Information.....	2	Solid wastes.....	29
Committees.....	38	Marketing.....	53	Sugar and syrup.....	52
Consumer protection..	38, 50	Meat imports.....	12	Supplemental	
Contracts.....	47	Migrant labor.....	6	appropriations.....	1
Credit.....	20	National parks.....	24	Tariff schedules.....	52
Data processing.....	2	Natural resources.....	13	Taxation.....	5, 22, 37
Education.....	15	Opinion poll.....	28	Timber yield.....	36
Environment.....	8, 38	Personnel.....	14, 41	Trails.....	45
Farm labor.....	21	Pesticides.....	17, 43	Water quality.....	23
Federal aid.....	15, 33	Pollution.....	23, 29	Weather.....	46
Fees and charges.....	39	Postal rates.....	32	Welfare.....	33
Food additives.....	48	Potatoes.....	53	Wheat agreement.....	30
Foreign trade.....	12, 16, 30, 42	Poverty.....	6	Wilderness.....	44
Forestry.....	36, 44	Property.....	51	Wildlife.....	40

HIGHLIGHTS: House debated second supplemental appropriation bill. Rep. Edwards, Calif., claimed USDA "flagrant violator" of Title VI, Civil Rights Act. Several Representatives supported President's proposed food and nutrition program. Sen. Dole et al, introduced and Sen. Dole discussed rural telephone supplemental financing bill.

HOUSE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS: Began debate on H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969 (pp. H3829-52). The Rules Committee earlier reported a resolution for the consideration of the bill (p. H3896).
2. INFORMATION; DATA PROCESSING. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10791, to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to direct the Comptroller General to establish information and data processing systems (H. Rept. 91-258). p. H3896
3. RESEARCH. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11271, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, etc. p. H3896.
4. CIVIL RIGHTS. Rep. Edwards, Calif., stated that before the House votes on the USDA appropriation bill he wished to "raise an issue which reflects on the ability of the Department of Agriculture to expend those sums in accord with Federal law." He stated this Department "is a flagrant violator" of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act "which prohibits the use of Federal funds in programs that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin," and listed the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights' findings of "widespread discrimination in employment and discriminatory program administration" within the Department. pp. H3877-82
5. TAX REFORM. Rep. Vanik spoke on the "urgency for tax reform and tax relief." p. H3825
6. POVERTY; MIGRANT LABOR. Rep. Fascell expressed pleasure that OEO has recommended that the South Florida Migrant Legal Services Program, Inc., be re-funded in fiscal year 1970. p. H3824
7. HUNGER. Several Members praised the President's nutrition program. pp. H3856, H3859-67, H3884-5
8. ENVIRONMENT. Rep. Daddario discussed the national policy dealing with the problems of the environment and listed essential elements contained in a congressional paper on the subject. pp. H3854-6
9. RECREATION. Rep. Landgrebe defended his bill to define the boundaries of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore against "misleading statements" by Rep. Mikva. pp. H3855-7
10. BUDGET. Rep. Marsh commended the President on his revised budget but stated that "it still must be understood by the Congress and by the country that the general fund for the operations of the Federal Government is still in deficit and not in surplus based on present estimates." pp. H3873-4
Received from the President proposed amendments to the requests for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1970 (H. Doc. 91-117). p. H3896

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST TITLE IV OF
H.R. 11400

MAY 20, 1969.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 414]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 414, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 414

[Report No. 91-260]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 20, 1969

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R.
2 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal
3 year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, all
4 points of order against title IV of said bill are hereby
5 waived.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 414

[Report No. 91-260]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the waiver of points of order against title IV of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COLLIER

May 20, 1969

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) and, myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11400, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we come to the consideration of the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1969, the first major appropriation bill for the 91st Congress. It deals with the fiscal year 1969 insofar as the funds are concerned. And it contains an important provision—an expenditure ceiling—with respect to fiscal year 1970.

I hope the items in the bill will be explored by the Members and that the House will work its will on this bill. In the Committee on Appropriations, we think we have done the best we could, but we make no claim of infallibility. We have cut the requests by some \$581 million. If there are further reductions which are desired, Members of course, are free to offer the amendments to bring about the reductions.

SUMMARY OF THE PENDING BILL

We have reduced the budget estimates which were before us by about 13 percent. Most of the items and the bulk of the total requests before the committee were of a mandatory character and we had no practical option to recommending approval of the necessary funds. We had to provide funds, for example, for pay increases which had been provided in previous legislation.

It is an old refrain that Congress in the regular appropriation bills reduces the annual money measures and then early in the next session restores the reductions which were made, and that therefore the reductions originally made

result in no reductions at all. This is not correct. For example, in this bill less than 1 percent of the new funds provided represents a restoration of funds which were reduced last year. And the restorations—some \$34 million—represent about one-third of 1 percent of the approximately \$12 billion cut last year in new funds requested for fiscal 1969. That, I think, is a rather good record.

There are many, many items in the bill before us, and there is no way to be fully familiar with the contents of the bill other than to study the bill and the report, so I would commend to all a careful reading of the report on the bill. There are innumerable items representing, I believe, practically every department and agency of the Government.

The bill proposes new appropriations, or budget authority, in the sum of about \$3,783,000,000. It is, as I said, about \$581 million less than the budget requests, a cut of about 13 percent.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend, I include, for purposes of elaboration, excerpts from the report summarizing the main features of the bill:

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The bill is divided into five titles: I—Military operations in Southeast Asia, II—General supplementals (various), III—Increased pay costs, IV—Ceiling on 1970 expenditures, and V—General provisions.

The grand total of new budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill is \$3,783,212,766, a reduction of about 13%, or \$580,794,190, from the revised budget requests of \$4,364,006,956 considered.

In addition, under title II there are proposed increases of \$82,500,000 in limitations on annual contract authorizations involving interest subsidies for homeownership and rental housing assistance and college housing. The budget requests for these total \$104,500,000, so there is a reduction of \$22,000,000. Also, numerous provisions in the bill would release \$82,766,000 held in reserve under the cutback provisions of Public Law 90-364.

The amounts in the bill are within the overall totals of budget authority for 1969 shown in the administration's budget review released April 15th. That is, they are well within the totals contemplated in that review. And they are also well below the supplemental provisions contemplated for fiscal 1969 in the budget last January.

The January budget projected fiscal 1969 budget authority supplementals of \$4,813,000,000, inclusive of \$198,000,000 dependent on legislation which is not yet enacted. Of the remainder (\$4,615,000,000), a total of \$4,365,000,000 in new budget authority was submitted to the House and considered in connection with the accompanying bill. An additional \$221,000,000 in new budget authority requests for 1969—finalized after House Committee hearings were closed out—was submitted to the Senate (S. Doc. 91-18) for consideration in connection with this bill. Thus the total of such budget authority requests now indicated is \$4,586,000,000, or, in round figures, \$29,000,000 below the \$4,615,000,000 mentioned above.

This is the way the total picture stands on 1969 supplementals as of this date. It is a net result; the new administration reviewed and revised many of the supplemental requests submitted by the previous administration and made a number of reductions. But as the totals now stand, increases submitted have offset all but \$29,000,000 of the decreases from the January budget that were projected on April 15 (again, not counting the \$198,000,000 that hinges on legislation).

Summary by titles

Title I, *Defense military*, includes \$1,234,000,000 for military operations in Southeast Asia. This compares with the revised request of \$1,496,900,000, a reduction of \$262,900,000, or about 17 percent.

Title II, *for sundry general supplementals*, includes \$1,365,914,312, a reduction of \$39,736,850, or just under 3% from the budget requests of \$1,405,651,162 in new budget (obligational) authority. Some releases of reserves and other non-add provisions are involved. Increases of \$82,500,000—a reduction of \$22,000,000 from the request—are also proposed in limitations on annual contract authorizations in certain interest subsidy programs in the housing field.

The details are set forth under the various chapters in the committee report, but the great bulk of title II relates to items not subject to effective discretionary control in the annual bills. Some 83% or \$1,132,000,000, of the total, for example, is involved in grants to states for public assistance; veterans compensation, medical, and other costs; unemployment compensation payments; military retired pay; and disaster relief.

Title III, *for increased pay costs*, includes \$1,183,298,454 in new budget (obligational) authority, an overall reduction of \$278,157,340, or about 19 percent from the revised budget requests of \$1,461,455,794. Release of \$62,277,000 of P.L. 90-364 reserves is also involved, plus numerous transfers between appropriations to enable greater absorption of pay costs.

These supplementals relate to unabsorbed portions of pay raises generally effective last July 1 that were not taken into account in the regular 1969 appropriations.

The Executive Branch had combed the estimates initially and the new administration had also reexamined them. Since the estimates are for mandatory-type costs that have been running all fiscal year, the Committee could not make drastic additional cuts all across the boards this late in the fiscal year without creating unacceptable disruption to operations.

Title IV, *limitation on 1970 budget outlays*, proposes an overall ceiling on expenditures of the government during the fiscal year 1970 that begins on July 1, 1969. The proposal is explained in considerable detail beginning on page 118 of the report of the committee on the bill.

Title V, *general provisions*, contains general provisions customarily carried.

Approximate effect on 1969 expenditures—budget outlays

It is the committee's tentative estimate that the reduction of \$580,794,190 in new budget (obligational) authority requests, plus the relatively minor changes in requested transfers between appropriations, and reserve releases, will translate into a reduction of approximately \$464,000,000 in budget outlays previously projected for fiscal year 1969, by titles of the bill roughly as follows: title I, \$165,000,000; title II, \$26,000,000; and title III, \$273,000,000. The reductions in the interest subsidy contract authorizations limitations would not affect projected 1969 outlays.

The outlay effect of the remainder of the reduction in new budget authority and interest subsidy contract authorization limitations would be of some consideration in determining the impact of congressional actions on fiscal 1970 budget outlays; perhaps to a minor extent, even on fiscal 1971 outlays.

I believe there will be a desire on the part of the House to discuss some of the military implications involved, and the war in Southeast Asia. Some may want to discuss the antiballistic missile program and other controversial or semi-

controversial matters. We have agreed on the 3 hours in which to discuss these matters.

EXPENDITURE CEILING PROPOSAL—TITLE IV

Mr. Chairman, I should like to claim your attention, if I may, at this time for the purpose of discussing a portion of the bill which appears on page 61. The report deals adequately with this proposal. It proposes an expenditure limitation—a spending ceiling. I believe it is important that all Members be familiar with the expenditure ceiling.

I should like to read the ceiling which we propose to fix in this bill. Page 61 of the bill, title IV:

Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

Mr. Chairman, that is the ceiling provision, subsection (a) of it.

Subsection (b) is the reporting provision, which I insert here for reference purposes:

(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend, and before proceeding further, let me insert an excerpt from the report which briefly states the nature of the proposition:

The committee has included a provision in the bill that would place an overall ceiling on budget expenditures during the fiscal year 1970 that begins on July 1, 1969. The precise terminology is "Expenditures and net lending"—which, taken together, constitute "budget outlays".

The amount specifically stated in the provision, \$192,900,000,000, is a beginning figure, not an ending figure. It is the revised projection of 1970 budget outlays announced by the President on April 12 and summarized in the Review of the 1970 Budget released on April 15. That summary appears in the Congressional Record of April 16, 1969, at pages E2993-2996.

Coupled to the \$192.9 billion figure is language providing—" * * * That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted."

In other words, Congress would work from the President's proposed total spending estimate. It would do so through its actions, or its inactions, on requests for appropriations and other budget obligatory authority and outlay proposals in the various appropriation bills and certain other bills affecting the budget.

The language would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with the estimated expenditure effect of specific congressional actions or inactions having budgetary impact.

It is a flexible provision—but in terms of aggregate spending, flexible only on the action of the Congress, not the Executive.

It does not seek to declare something of the end from the beginning; it sets a beginning point against which Congress would work in deciding, through its various spending actions, what the ultimate total should be, and supplies a mechanism for resetting the ceiling accordingly.

Unlike last year's ceiling provision, it does not impose an arbitrary broad-axe type ceiling cutback that would leave to the Executive the allocation of any congressional expenditure reduction to specific agencies and programs.

It would be the first ceiling ever to place directly in the hands of Congress the specific decision as to the maximum amount to be taken out of the Treasury for payment of the Government's bills in a given 12-month period.

Mr. Chairman, we are at a moment when for the first time in the history of this Republic, Members of Congress are being called upon to vote on an expenditure ceiling which covers the entire Federal Government. This kind of legislation has never been passed by the Congress during the history of the country.

This is an expenditure limitation which is all inclusive. It includes the Veterans' Administration. It includes the Defense Department. It includes the war in Vietnam. It includes interest on the national debt. It includes all expenditures. Nothing is exempt.

POTENTIAL REDUCTION EFFECT AND COMPARISON TO LAST YEAR'S CEILING

We have an expenditure limitation for fiscal year 1969 and we had an expenditure limitation of sorts in the prior year. But in the fiscal 1969 version we have a series of exceptions and exemptions. Indeed we exempted about \$99 billion of fiscal 1969 currently estimated expenditures.

The Congress reduced expenditures by about \$6 billion in the fiscal year ending on June 30. However, we did not reduce net expenditures of the Government significantly due to increases in exempted areas. In those areas where we had made exemptions, expenditure increases totaled approximately \$6 billion. That offsetting increase left a relatively slight net reduction in the January 1968 budget estimate of expenditures for fiscal 1969. On the other hand, except for our action last year, expenditures would no doubt have increased by several billions.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I include additional excerpts from the committee report comprising title IV of the pending bill with last year's ceiling and drawing attention to the reduction potential of the ceiling now proposed.

It is a rigid ceiling; it cannot be exceeded except upon action by the Congress. And as indicated above, the ceiling would decrease if congressional actions on the budget so provide.

It lays the basis for potentially very significant retrenchment in expenditures. If such a ceiling had been adopted—and strictly adhered to—over the last many years, billions of expenditures would have been avoided.

More specifically, taking all 14 budgets for the post-Korea fiscal years 1955 through 1968,

the projected expenditure totals in the original annual budgets were cumulatively exceeded by about \$50 billion. In 11 of the 14 years, the overruns aggregated \$53.3 billion. In 3 years, there were underruns aggregating \$3.5 billion. But overall for the 14 years, the government actually expended—for a variety of reasons—about \$50 billion more than the sum total of what was projected in the original budgets. That averages to about \$3.4 billion a year. So the potential is great, if the ceiling is adopted and adhered to.

Unlike the expenditure ceiling provisions enacted in the last session applicable to fiscal 1969, nothing would be exempt from the ceiling. Last year's ceiling provisions had a very significant impact on government spending in fiscal 1969. They significantly restrained the growth of spending that undoubtedly would have otherwise occurred. And on the latest figures, it seems beyond reasonable debate that in the absence of the ceiling provisions, a much needed budget surplus for 1969 would not now be in prospect. But even with the ceiling and the \$6 billion cutback Congress did not, by its actions, diminish the originally projected budget expenditure (outlay) total of \$186.1 billion.

It did prevent that total from being exceeded. And it did restrain growth of spending.

More specifically, Congress exempted 50%—\$92.6 billion—of the \$186.1 billion from the \$6 billion cutback, and expressly permitted overruns to the extent determined necessary in the exempted programs. Those overruns were reestimated in the April 15 budget review at \$6.1 billion. The overruns in exempted areas wiped out the \$6 billion cutback in non-exempt areas.

In its specific actions on the individual appropriation and other spending bills, Congress last year contributed roughly \$3.7 to \$3.9 billion (depending on variable calculations) to the \$6 billion overall cutback, leaving the remainder to be allocated by the Executive. The April 15 Review reflects a total cutback of \$7.3 billion from the original estimates for non-exempted areas. Offsetting this gross cutback are the \$6.1 billion overruns in exempted areas leaving a net estimated cutback, as of April 15 of \$1.2 billion from the originally projected total.

Thus the latest estimate of spending for 1969 is \$184.9 billion, \$1.2 billion less than the \$186.1 billion projected in the original 1969 budget. But it should be noted that about \$1.5 billion of the \$7.3 billion reduction now shown in non-exempted areas is not a cut in the more conventional sense, but rather financing adjustments because the Banks for Cooperatives, the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, and the Federal National Mortgage Association secondary market operations, which were in the original \$186.1 billion budget total, subsequently became 100% privately owned and thus dropped from the Federal totals.

Of course, the \$7.3 billion reduction figure is a composite of the specific congressional actions, the financing adjustments, actual curtailments of outlays, and administrative reestimates of expenditures—both up and down—in many items as conditions changed. There are signs that further reestimates upward in certain programs will substantially diminish the \$7.3 billion figure and thus in turn the \$1.2 billion figure.

The ceiling proposed in this bill would afford opportunity for maximum flexibility within the overall total to meet, as fully as reasonably possible, changed and changing expenditure requirements in certain specific programs that cannot be foreseen with great precision. The new administration has variously indicated that it intends to seek, on a continuing basis, economies in operations and to look for lower-priority areas when it needs room for increases within its stated policy of strict fiscal restraint. An aggregate ceiling would be facilitating in this regard.

Of course, the President can seek supplemental relief to meet necessary but unforeseen and unavoidable outlay increases which he finds cannot be accommodated within the overall total.

Setting a beginning ceiling in this fashion should in no way discourage the Executive Branch from its continuing commitment—and responsibility—for seeking to conduct the day-to-day management of government programs at the very minimum cost consistent with the public necessities, refraining from spending every dollar that can reasonably be saved. Constructive economy in public spending is not only a matter of legislative decision. It is also a matter of administration. The new administration has attached high priority to quality of performance in administering the government. Wasteful and needless expenditures often do not become so until funds are poorly managed. The primary burden of getting a dollar's value for every dollar justifiably appropriated to the purposes of government lies mainly with those who administer, not with those who legislate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Now, there was a good basis last year for exempting agencies, but let me say to you that there is, in my judgment, based on presently available information, no good basis for exempting agencies this year. Last year, we were cutting the estimate of expenditures by \$6 billion and therefore we did feel some exemptions were desired and these exemptions were proposed. Then, of course, there were additional exemptions which were provided later. Last year, we proposed a cut in the estimate of expenditures, but in title IV of the pending bill, we are not proposing any cut in the estimate of expenditures. So it makes no sense to exempt the Veterans' Administration, or the interest on the national debt, or any other item. It makes no sense to exempt anything in this bill, because we are proposing an expenditure limitation or ceiling at the exact and precise limitations which have been estimated in the revised budget of the administration.

The budget this year ought to be more accurate in many respects that it was in many previous years, because ordinarily a budget is put into shape to a very considerable extent in the fall of the year preceding the year for which it begins, that is, the following January 1. However, we are now operating on an expenditure budget which was refined, redesigned, and reexamined since January 20. It is more up to date and should be more trustworthy. The revised budget of the administration on which this provision is based was submitted only a month ago.

So I hope we will not at this time yield to the temptation of trying to make any exemptions whatever.

THE ARITHMETIC AND MECHANICS OF THE PROPOSED CEILING

Mr. Chairman, let me hasten to add—and I realize this is a dull subject, but it is very important and will become increasingly more important—let me add that we will change this ceiling if we appropriate more money than was estimated for appropriation in the budget. In other words, if we increase appro-

priations and spending through appropriations, then this will be translated to the ceiling and increase the ceiling. If this year we were to do we did last year when we reduced the President's appropriation budget by about \$12 billion, that would be translated into an expenditure reduction amount not of \$12 billion but into the amount that would be spent in the forthcoming year, fiscal 1970. That might be half that sum or one-third of that sum or some other percentage.

This ceiling is mandatory; it is inflexible; it is the law of the land from which the executive branch cannot escape. The executive branch will of course have the authority to make adjustments within various programs and within those programs accommodate to better management and so forth. The administration can come to Congress and say, "Our estimates which we made as to spending last April have proved to be faulty and we would ask you to make certain adjustments to the ceiling." This would then be a matter for Congress to decide upon.

So, if we increase appropriations for various programs, then the budget ceiling will go beyond \$192.9 billion by whatever figure might be mandated by the increase.

Mr. Chairman, so that the RECORD will reflect more precisely how the ceiling would work, I include additional exploratory excerpts from the committee report:

THE ARITHMETIC AND MECHANICS OF THE CEILING

The ceiling begins by legislating a *net* reduction of \$2,372,000,000 in budget outlays projected for 1970 in the original (January) budget—from \$195.3 billion down to the \$192.9 billion April 15 revised projection of the present administration. But the *gross* ceiling reduction is \$4,020,000,000; this was offset by \$1.6 billion in the recent budget review by upward "corrections" in several specific projections in the original budget.

The \$4 billion cutback in outlays includes \$1.1 billion in defense, \$1 billion for a modification of the previously proposed \$1.6 billion increase in social security benefits, and \$1.9 billion for programs affecting almost every Federal agency.

In the April 15 review in which the \$4 billion cutback in outlays was projected the administration also proposed *gross* cutbacks of \$5.5 billion (\$4.2 billion, net after the "correcting" adjustments of \$1.3 billion) in appropriation and other budget obligatory authority requests, \$3 billion of this is in defense and \$2.5 billion in all other areas of the budget. Budget obligatory authority (appropriations, essentially) is the traditional basis on which appropriation and authorization bills are stated and voted on regardless of the year or years in which the funds are to be actually disbursed in the form of budget outlays.

The gross total for new budget authority for 1970 in the January budget is \$210.1 billion, and in the April 15 revision, \$205.9 billion—including so-called permanent budget authority, such as interest, trust funds, etc., which does not actually appear in the annual bills.

The Committee on Appropriations and several other committees have before them for consideration these revised appropriation requests and other budgetary recommendations for fiscal 1970. What Congress does in the bills dealing with these various budget authority proposals plus a handful of other proposals involving outlays but not budget authority basically determines what happens to the \$192.9 billion beginning ceiling in the accompanying bill.

For example, net reductions made through

the appropriation bills would translate into net downward adjustments to the \$192.9 billion figure. And in this general connection, some \$38 billion of the appropriation budget requests are first subject to processing through the various annual authorization bills.

In the area of proposed legislation for which the outlay budget includes specific sums, several have the effect of holding the outlay total lower than it otherwise would be. Several, of course, involve additional outlays. For example, if Congress does not enact the proposed postal rate increase, the outlay ceiling, according to the latest estimate available, would be adjusted *upward* by some \$600 million. This is because postal revenues are counted as offsets to expenditures, not as budget receipts.

If the budget proposal to authorize the Farmers Home Administration to make insured rather than direct operating loans is not enacted, the outlay ceiling, according to the budget, would be adjusted *upward* by \$292 million.

If the budget proposal for legislation to restrict public assistance medical aid for patients in mental institutions to 120 days is not enacted, the outlay ceiling, according to the budget, would be adjusted *upward* by \$126 million.

Several legislative proposals designed to diminish budget outlays by the Veterans Administration are priced in the outlay total to save some \$288 million in 1970. Failure of those, according to the budget figures, would be the basis for an equivalent *upward* adjustment in the ceiling.

These four examples aggregate \$1.3 billion. On the other hand, again for example, if the President's proposal for social security benefit increases is not enacted, the \$600 million (of the original budget amount of \$1.6 billion) in the revised budget outlay figure would not now be needed for that purpose, in which case the outlay ceiling would *drop* by \$600 million.

As to the mechanics for adjusting the ceiling, timeliness in accommodating government programs to congressional changes is essential to orderly administration. Congress will be processing budgetary recommendations in many different bills, passing through various legislative stages over a period of several months—virtually all after the fiscal year begins. And it seems essential in the interest of consistency and otherwise to center responsibility in one place for at least tentative determination of congressional action impact.

The Director of the Budget is probably in the best position to make such determinations. The monthly reports submitted by the Director under subsection (b) of the ceiling provision can be evaluated currently. They can be checked for consistency and reasonableness with tentative estimates frequently made through the budget "scorekeeping" reports of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures and with those of the Committees on Appropriations. Amendatory action can be taken if that seems to be necessary in the circumstances.

AUTHORIZATIONS AND APPROPRIATIONS: THE KEYS TO SPENDING CONTROL

Mr. Chairman, for a long time, I fought along with others the so-called Bow amendment fixing a ceiling on expenditures, and I do not apologize for that. But, I have come to the conclusion that an expenditure ceiling can be meaningful, and that it will encourage greater focus of attention by Congress and the country and the press upon spending. But in embracing this idea of an expenditure ceiling as here proposed, I do not want us for any means to delude ourselves. The best means and the most appropriate and effective way to reduce Government

spending is to hold the line on authorizations and appropriations. That is a lead pipe cinch method of holding down Government spending. It is the surest and the safest. In a limit on spending in a given fiscal year—and this would limit spending only for the fiscal year, 1 year, which begins on July 1—we do not rescind the money, we do not recapture the authority—we simply say that in fiscal year 1970 you cannot spend more than so much, but the funds which have been appropriated in prior years will remain available for expenditure. So by all means, the best way for us to achieve a reduction in the cost of Government and effective control of Government spending is to quit authorizing and appropriating so generously.

But, there are reasons other than those which I have stated for supporting an expenditure limitation. Government is growing bigger and more complex.

Now, let me give this figure which may shock some of the public, but which may not shock Members of Congress who are more aware of fiscal complexities.

If we should today appropriate all of the money and grant all of the authority requested by the administration in the pending budget in fiscal 1970 on July 1 the Government would have \$431 billion available for expenditure. But it is not now projected by the administration that more than \$192.9 billion will be spent. So, in this expenditure ceiling for the first time in the history of the Nation we are undertaking to say, "Yes, we fix the annual appropriations, but we are going a step further this year and are going to fix the annual expenditures." While we have previously authorized all the carryover funds involved, we by this limitation fix the overall rate of spending for a given year, namely fiscal year 1970.

This limitation, this ceiling, has been fixed in such a way that it ought to be, it seems to me, palatable to the rank and file of the Members of the Congress. We have drawn the limitation in such a way as to get, we hope, majority support.

Mr. Chairman, on the question of the most effective means of controlling spending, I include an additional excerpt from the report of the committee. It reflects a position long held in the committee:

While there are some grounds for doubt that the outlay (bill-paying) stage of the fiscal process is the most logical or the most effective point at which the Congress should seek to control government spending, an overall ceiling on outlays in a given year has some usefulness as a short-run regulating device, especially when the economic and fiscal situations are under great stress as at present. But there is room for great doubt that such a ceiling can realistically be regarded as an effective long-run control procedure.

As today is the consequence of yesterday, so tomorrow is the consequence of today. Legislative authorizations are the seedbeds of future expenditure growth. Initial authorization of a program or project is the beginning point in the legislative spending process. If the program or project, whatever it may be, is not authorized by the Congress, then no appropriation is in order. But the facts are that virtually every year new programs and projects are authorized, and old programs are often extended and expanded. Seldom are existing programs and activities

deauthorized via the basic legislative route. Fiscally, the cumulative result is increasing demands on the Federal Treasury.

In the long range sense as distinguished from any particular fiscal year, too much emphasis is attached to controlling growth of government spending by applying the control at the end of the spending process. It is more logically and effectively applicable at the authorization and appropriation stages.

Appropriations are not in order unless there is first a legislative authorization. No funds can be withdrawn from the Treasury but in consequence of valid authority granted by the Congress to first create an obligation in behalf of the Government. That is the key to the situation. The most consistently accurate barometer to future spending levels is the dimensions of budget authority enacted by the Congress to enter into obligations on behalf of the Government.

Authorize something new or enlarge an existing authorization and a request for new obligating authority is almost certain to follow.

Denial of authority to obligate precludes a subsequent expenditure.

Curtail the input of new appropriations (and other forms of obligating authority) and spending will come down.

Grant authority to obligate and the obligation inevitably will follow in due time.

Once the obligation is made and the bill comes due, the check to pay it (the outlay) must also inevitably follow in due time.

FLEXIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED CEILING

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I direct the gentleman's attention to the report where it says that this will be the first ceiling ever to be placed directly in the hands of the Congress. This is what the committee says in the report.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It would be the first overall ceiling placed in the hands of the Congress, and Congress can work its will, and what Congress can do today, of course, it can modify tomorrow.

Some have said that the ceiling ought to be inflexible on the Congress. If you make it a mandate on the executive, they ask, why not make it a mandate on the Congress? There is no power on earth to fix a ceiling or a limitation on expenditures on the Congress itself. What Congress can do today it can undo tomorrow.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has pointed out, and as I understand the matter, we have set a spending ceiling at \$192.9 billion, about \$193 billion, which is exactly the Nixon budget, as a level.

We have set the ceiling at this level, which means spending cannot go beyond this amount, but if Congress takes action to increase the appropriations, by being a flexible ceiling, it goes up, or if the Congress fails to take action which is recommended in the budget it may go up or down, according to what the Congress does. The committee has set the budget at the Nixon level, but what may be the ultimate result will be dependent upon what Congress does in appropriations and in authorizations.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. But this is going to be a limitation

which is not aimed at the administration itself, as the gentleman will agree.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. MAHON. We have set for the last couple of years limitations of sorts, but they have not been passed this early in the year as this one would be, and they have been limitations predicated on cuts below the budget. Title IV of the pending bill is quite a different matter.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, we are here setting a flexible limitation at the very outset on the Congress, which can be revised up or down, depending upon the actions of the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

I want to say this in defense of the administration, or of any administration: It is impossible for any administration to predict in January or April precisely what may be spent. It may be that the administration will find that certain adjustments cannot be made depending on the trend of events in the war, or otherwise, which might bring about a requirement for a change.

The administration of course would have the liberty, as it always does, to come before us with a supplemental—and the bill before us today is nothing but a supplemental presented to us by the present administration, the Nixon administration. It is a supplemental, and we inevitably have to have supplementals at times though they must be avoided wherever possible.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman point out further that this is a flexible ceiling—I mean, this is a flexible thing which can be revised up or down, depending upon the actions of the Congress.

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES AND THE DIMENSIONS OF ANNUAL ACTIONS

The gentleman further points out in his report to the unobligated and unexpended carryovers. I believe this is very significant, as found on page 122 of the report. It says:

For example, total unexpended carryover balances at the beginning of fiscal 1970 will approximate \$226 billion—

That is, \$226 billion of money unspent in carryovers from previous actions of the Congress:

Mr. MAHON. This \$226 billion figure may at first glance seem to be perfectly outrageous and a reflection upon the Congress in making available such large sums that will be carried over in the pipeline to the next fiscal year.

But much of this money is in social security funds that have not been expended.

Much of it is in military procurement programs.

Much of it relates to space and atomic energy and such things as I am about to relate in this unexpended category. It ranges over the whole Government, really.

For example, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has about \$3 billion. It is not anticipated that this will be expended, but it is available for expenditure. It is an unobligated carryover.

For example, the Congress passed a bill granting riot insurance and flood insurance, and there are \$500 million—a half billion dollars—involved in this fund.

In all probability they would not be expended, but they are within the \$226 billion. I shall elaborate on that question a little further in my remarks.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Would the gentleman say that this is a moderate limitation? Some have thought that it is a very small limitation, and it should go further. Would the gentleman characterize his amendment as a moderate one?

Mr. MAHON. I would so characterize it, and I thank the gentleman. I would say it is a moderate one.

It may be too firm for the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I can see why the Director may prefer not to have to live with this amendment. But it will help the Director of the Bureau of the Budget hold the line with the Government agencies and Government departments. If he gets into difficulty that is in any manner unavoidable, he can seek relief from the Congress.

There are also those who say it is meaningless, that it has no teeth, so it must be pretty good since we have opposition from both sides.

Mr. Chairman, under leave granted, I include further exploratory material from the committee report on the matter of carryover balances. And in this connection, I am inserting supplementary statistical material:

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES AND THE DIMENSIONS OF ANNUAL ACTIONS

The proposed ceiling provision, being all-inclusive, covers expenditures in fiscal 1970 from budget authority to be newly granted in this session; expenditures from so-called permanent appropriations that flow automatically from earlier laws; and expenditures from unexpended carryover balances of prior years. Very substantial portions of the \$192.9 billion beginning ceiling figure spring from each of these three general sources of expenditure availability.

For example, total unexpended carryover balances at the beginning of fiscal 1970 will approximate \$226 billion—about \$100 billion in social security and other trust funds and \$126 billion in Federal funds. But some \$77 billion of the \$126 billion of Federal funds will have been obligated for programs across the government but not yet actually paid out. The remaining \$49 billion, not obligated and not expended, is in many accounts across the government; there is a comprehensive and informative special analysis of it in the January budget, Special Analysis G, pp. 78-93.

But of the \$226 billion total beginning carryover, trust and federal funds combined, roughly \$86 billion is projected for expenditure (disbursement, that is) in fiscal 1970, and roughly that amount is thus counted in the \$192.9 billion ceiling figure. The remainder—some \$138 billion after a small lapse amount—becomes part of the total unexpended carryover projected into the following year, fiscal 1971.

Roughly then, it can be seen that only about \$107 billion of the newly projected outlay total for 1970 (\$192.9 billion, less the \$86 billion from carryovers) is estimated to come from the \$205.9 billion new budget authority requested or estimated for that same year of 1970. Funds appropriated in a given year are expended partly in that year and partly in subsequent years because of long lead-times, construction time, and other factors.

To put the relationship of budget authority and outlays in some better focus by way of extreme illustration, if the whole \$205 billion of new budget authority for 1970 failed, the expenditure outlay reduction in 1970, based on the budget, would be only

\$107 billion. The remainder would be an expenditure avoided in subsequent years.

But to put the picture in sharper focus, it must be noted that Congress does not annually act on anywhere near the entire new budget authority total. Some of it is in the form of requests and some of it is in the form of estimates. Roughly \$66 billion, net, of the new budget authority total is estimated to go on the books in 1970 automatically—so-called permanent appropriations—under earlier laws, mainly trust funds, interest on the debt, and several others. The other \$139 billion goes through the annual bill process—mostly the appropriation bills—but it involves projected expenditures, as to 1970, of roughly only \$90 billion, more or less which means that Congress, in the various annual bills, normally deals with new budget authority amounts that, in total, relate to less than half of the budget outlays projected for that same year. As noted, more than half of budget outlays in a given year now derive from carryover balances and from new budget authority that goes on the books automatically under various permanent appropriation arrangements enacted over the years.

The size of the unexpended carryover pipeline, of course, depends on what is put in and what is taken out. Addition of more new budget authority than is expended in a year increases the pipeline. During fiscal 1970, based on the recent budget projections, the total unexpended pipeline would increase from \$226 billion to \$237 billion, but all of the increase is more than accounted for in trust fund accumulations of balances. In Federal funds, there is a drop of \$1 billion, from \$126 billion to \$125 billion. Depending on congressional actions, this could drop further.

CONTROLLABLE VERSUS UNCONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURES

All expenditures are, of course, controllable by the Congress. All expenditures are controlled by Congress, because they flow from laws enacted by Congress. But as a very practical matter, not all are subject to effective discretionary control through the normal annual budget and appropriations process.

Very considerable expenditures arise from so-called permanent appropriations that do not pass through the annual appropriation

bills. Interest on the debt and trust funds are examples.

Several programs that do pass through the annual bill process involve mandated-type expenditures fixed in basic law, which unless changed through legislation operate as a practical limit on the discretionary power to control them annually. Veterans pensions and public assistance matching grants are examples.

Payments for prior year contracts and obligations falling due cannot effectively be avoided. These run across the whole government.

There are a number of others. The January budget classifies some \$98 billion, or about half of the 1970 outlay budget, as "relatively uncontrollable civilian outlays under present law." The figure for the April 15 budget review under this classification is \$100 billion, meaning that better than half of the outlay budget for the year is not, as a practical matter, subject to the normal discretionary powers of appropriation without changes in the basic laws that more or less ordain them.

Similarly, though the makeup in detail does not exactly correspond, in the \$6 billion cutback provision of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act last session, Congress exempted from the ceiling and from the cutback, programs involving about half of total outlays, in effect recognizing their relative uncontrollability without changes in the basic laws applicable or other compelling circumstances giving rise to them.

Looking at the matter in terms of increases rather than totals, about 75% of the outlay increase, 1970 over 1969, projected in the January budget was in these so-called relatively uncontrollable items. The proportion applicable to the \$8 billion outlay increase, 1970 over 1969, projected in the new administration's budget review is even greater.

The outlay ceiling proposed by the committee for 1970, while rigid and all-encompassing, does not and cannot of course come to grips with these fundamentals of basic laws. But by covering both controllable and "uncontrollable" outlays, it will focus on the total, and keep it in focus.

It will tend to force attention on possible alternatives and substitutions when upward pressures are exerted on the ceiling.

It will keep the hands of Congress on it.

TABLE 8.—BALANCES OF BUDGET AUTHORITY (FROM THE JANUARY 1969 BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970)
(In millions of dollars)

Department or other unit	Start 1968		End 1968		End 1969		End 1970	
	Obligated	Unobligated	Obligated	Unobligated	Obligated	Unobligated	Obligated	Unobligated
Funds appropriated to the President:								
International financial institutions.....	1,004	6,447	1,226	6,427	1,591	6,633	1,880	6,633
Military assistance.....	2,114	2,764	1,804	2,468	1,737	2,393	1,767	2,193
Economic assistance.....	3,790	860	3,685	690	3,248	391	3,364	622
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	1,140	6	982	8	1,018	5	1,207	6
Other.....	345	112	645	111	563	—87	578	—180
Agriculture.....	5,446	2,749	5,562	2,680	6,464	2,111	6,869	2,177
Commerce.....	973	225	1,086	258	1,241	209	1,254	122
Defense—Military.....	32,077	15,116	30,884	14,829	32,818	11,594	35,055	10,970
Defense—Civil.....	302	248	345	247	441	158	496	50
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	6,403	28,043	7,820	30,778	8,669	35,729	8,908	42,756
Housing and Urban Development.....	6,674	14,462	8,254	14,743	7,050	13,495	8,076	12,139
Interior.....	845	609	947	612	1,141	359	1,175	234
Labor.....	495	10,790	498	11,919	478	12,709	656	13,680
Transportation.....	7,271	3,409	7,286	4,154	8,531	4,679	9,070	5,102
Treasury.....	102	26	103	24	87	25	94	22
Atomic Energy Commission.....	1,138	320	1,115	385	1,563	56	1,486	—
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	1,820	313	1,616	381	1,624	118	1,552	(1)
Veterans' Administration.....	1,034	8,139	1,030	8,768	1,120	8,341	1,181	8,387
Civil Service Commission.....	642	17,690	701	18,505	834	20,522	981	21,936
Export-Import Bank.....	2,367	3,749	2,996	2,687	3,638	2,387	4,585	1,026
Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.....	248	6,340	257	6,590	281	6,870	297	7,176
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	30	3,468	61	3,697	33	4,033	17	4,447
Railroad Retirement Board.....	112	4,240	127	4,375	130	4,525	137	4,596
Other agencies.....	2,195	4,740	2,306	6,804	2,494	1,985	2,694	1,521
Allowance for contingencies.....					50		200	
Total balances.....	78,567	134,864	81,336	142,142	86,844	139,238	93,597	145,616
MEMORANDUM								
Federal funds.....	69,839	54,095	72,043	54,988	77,410	49,090	83,301	44,986
Trust funds.....	8,728	80,769	9,293	87,154	9,434	90,148	10,278	100,630

Less than \$500,000.

Note: Totals slightly revised in table that follows this table.

BUDGET REVIEW OF APRIL 15, 1969—CHANGE IN UNEXPENDED BALANCES
[In billions]

	January budget				Budget review estimate			
	Federal funds	Trust funds	Intragovernmental transactions	Total	Federal funds	Trust funds	Intragovernmental transactions	Total
Unexpended balance, June 30, 1968.....	127.0	96.4	-----	223.5	127.0	96.4	-----	223.5
1969 Budget authority.....	148.8	53.3	-----7.5	194.6	149.9	53.3	-----7.5	195.7
Expiring authority in 1969, etc.....	-1.2	-7.1	-----	-8.3	-1.2	-7.1	-----	-8.3
Less outlays.....	148.2	43.0	-----7.5	183.7	149.5	42.9	-----7.5	184.9
Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1969.....	126.5	99.6	-----	226.1	126.2	99.8	-----	226.0
1970 Budget authority.....	158.2	60.0	-----7.9	210.1	154.3	59.5	-----8.0	205.9
Expiring authority in 1970, etc.....	-1.7	-----	-----	-1.7	-1.7	-----	-----	-1.7
Less outlays.....	154.7	48.4	-----7.9	195.3	153.8	47.1	-----8.0	192.9
Estimated unexpended balance, June 30, 1970.....	128.3	110.9	-----	239.2	125.0	112.2	-----	237.2

BUDGET AUTHORITY
[Fiscal years, in billions]

Description	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate
Available through current action by the Congress:			
Previously enacted.....	\$134.4	\$128.9	-----
Proposed in this budget.....	-----	-----	\$134.4
To be requested separately:			
For supplemental requirements under present law.....	-----	4.5	0.1
Upon enactment of proposed legislation.....	-----	0.2	1.2
Allowances:			
Civilian and military pay increase.....	-----	-----	2.8
Contingencies.....	-----	-----	0.4
Subtotal, available through current action by the Congress.....	134.4	133.6	138.9
Available without current action by the Congress (permanent authorizations):			
Trust funds (existing law).....	47.8	53.5	59.1
Interest on the public debt.....	14.6	16.3	17.3
Other.....	5.4	5.4	4.3
Deductions for offsetting receipts:			
Interfund and intragovernmental transactions.....	-6.9	-8.7	-9.2
Proprietary receipts from the public.....	-4.7	-4.3	-4.5
Total budget authority.....	190.6	195.8	205.9

ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES (BUDGET OUTLAYS)
FISCAL YEARS 1969 AND 1970

Mr. Chairman, we have been referring to the beginning ceiling figure of \$192.9 billion representing budget outlays projected by the administration in its budget review of April 15. I include a table based on figures in that review, showing a breakdown by departments and agencies of the \$192.9 billion:

TABLE 8.—BUDGET OUTLAYS, 1969 AND 1970
[In millions of dollars]

Agency	1969 current estimate	1970 revised estimate
Agriculture.....	8,409	7,197
CCC.....	(5,492)	(4,482)
Commerce.....	872	1,079
Defense—military and military assistance.....	78,400	77,903
Corps of Engineers.....	1,192	1,159
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	46,259	50,551
Trust funds.....	(32,981)	(35,324)
Housing and Urban Development.....	2,017	2,823
Interior.....	889	830
Justice.....	517	730
Labor.....	3,503	3,690
Unemployment trust funds.....	(2,749)	(2,866)
Post Office.....	929	412
State.....	434	428
Transportation.....	6,211	6,753
Treasury.....	16,603	17,559
Interest on the public debt.....	(16,300)	(17,300)
Atomic Energy Commission.....	2,451	2,504
General Services Administration.....	413	407
NASA.....	4,247	3,897
Veterans' Administration.....	7,719	7,554
All other:		
Foreign economic assistance.....	1,925	1,760
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	1,880	1,870
Other agencies.....	5,136	6,538

TABLE 8.—BUDGET OUTLAYS, 1969 AND 1970—Continued
[In millions of dollars]

Agency	1969 current estimate	1970 revised estimate
Allowances for:		
Civilian and military pay increases.....	-----	2,800
Contingencies.....	-----	200
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions.....	-5,105	-5,745
Total.....	184,901	192,899

Note: Detail may not add due to rounding.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

MILITARY SPENDING PROGRAMS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman realizes that the Congress is not acting—but that we are reacting. The gentleman knows, of course, that whenever we get ready to reduce expenditures, everybody looks to the military.

Now you have the terrible situation of the people assigning the worst sort of conduct and motives to the so-called military-industrial complex. I am sure the gentleman knows that on Mr. McNamara's procurements for ships there was a cost overrun and Secretary Pack-

ard tells me that it will be an overrun of \$100 million.

This morning and on Thursday we are trying to find out what caused an inaccurate estimate—it is not all overrun—on the C-5A aircraft. There are a number of factors involved. The gentleman knows as well as I do that this Congress has not got the courage to stand up here and stop some of these crazy programs that we have, for instance, the Job Corps and the OEO and a lot of these things we are spending money on all over hell's half acre. But they will go to the military and cut them to smithereens. This is what it is coming to.

We have inaccurate estimates all over the lot in the military and when you superimpose that on the escalation caused by the increased cost of living, our military is going to come up short and we are going to have half a defense.

It would be far better to abolish certain items for the military and come clean with the American people and say, "We do not want you to have the Polaris program—we do not want you to have new bombers—even though the B-52's are 15 years old. We do not want you to modernize your navy yards. We do not want you to have a good merchant marine program. We do not want you to go on with the new fighter needs that were denied us under the McNamara programs. We do not want you to have a moon shot."

This is where these things are coming to. That is the weakness of provisions such as the one to which the gentleman referred. Why do we not cross each bridge at the time we come to it?

Mr. MAHON. That is what we propose to do. We will cross each bridge at the time we come to it as each appropriation bill is before us, or each bill from a legislative committee which mandates certain expenditures is before us. Action on these bills will in effect maintain, or lower, or raise the expenditure ceiling.

Mr. RIVERS. We probably hold longer hearings in our committee than any committee of the Congress. We have a number of subcommittees going now. They are trying their best to save money. The distinguished chairman's committee, in its wisdom, has acted, and I would like to say that if there is anyone for whom I have a higher regard than the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have not found him. But let me say this: We cannot approach it in the manner proposed with any degree of accuracy. We cannot have all the programs. I have enumerated unless we have sufficient funds. I am afraid we are going to come up short in our commitments to our own people, and to the security of America, and our commitments with whatever other friends we have, if we have any.

I want the gentleman to know that I do not agree with this approach. We should act on each program instead of reacting to the entire budget. The Constitution specifically provides that the one arm of our Government that has the direct responsibility of the Congress is the military. Yet we are neglecting this responsibility by provisions of the sort

proposed, and I am afraid it is a mistake.

Mr. MAHON. According to the estimates—and we are, for the time being, accepting the expenditure estimates of the administration—the military will expend about \$78 billion this fiscal year and a similar amount for next year. The full amount so estimated for next year—fiscal 1970—is provided for in the proposed spending ceiling in the bill before us.

If our military people, those with stars on their shoulders and those in civilian capacities, will run the Defense Department in a businesslike and efficient way, I would think that sums available and in prospect would be adequate. I would hope that the sums are more than adequate.

One of the things that disturbs me is that there have been so many mistakes made by the military. This has tended to generate a lack of confidence. I grant that the problems have been of great magnitude and complexity.

Let me say that I have confidence in the military. I do not have unlimited confidence in their managerial ability.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not know anybody who does.

Mr. MAHON. Let me give an example. I joined in cutting the military budget \$5 billion plus, last year. I am not beholden to any department of this Government. I want to make that clear. I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina shares this attitude completely.

With respect to management, just think of the humiliation we suffered a few days ago when the Navy, through neglect, let a submarine in a Navy shipyard go to the bottom. And what is that going to cost us? \$25 million. Of course, if we are going to let the defense dollar go down the drain in any such irresponsible manner as that, it would not be possible to supply the military with adequate funds.

I would say this: I have confidence in the administration and feel that expenditures in the military area will not be cut without any regard to the welfare of the country. I am aware that the Secretary of Defense served on the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Defense Subcommittee for many years.

I cannot think of him in a role of an appeaser or a nonspender when it comes to necessary defense expenditures. So I would say, let us take the Pentagon at its word as a starting point on the amount of funds needed. When our hearings on defense programs are completed we can reduce or increase the budget figure and the final figure agreed upon by Congress and enacted into law will determine what can be spent in fiscal 1970.

Now, before I yield to my good and distinguished friend, my able colleague, let me say that I believe in the ABM. I believe in a strong military program. I deplore the low estate in which the military finds itself. I want to see confidence restored in this area. We need to have respect and to have reason to have respect for all departments and branches of Government.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman gave wings to the very things I was talking about. I do not wear anybody's collar either. I am looking for encomiums, and I do not get them around Washington, as the gentleman knows.

I want to say this, that the military now has reached deplorable conditions. We have 60 percent of our fleet which is not fit to live on or in because someone budgeted too low. The chairman has not heard the last of the results of McNamara's systems analysis crowd. We have not heard the last of that. They are bringing disrespect and derision on military men who have not made a decision over there since McNamara darkened the doors of the Pentagon. We have deficits coming up day in and day out, day in and day out, over which the military men had no control.

We cannot think we can just put a hard, hidebound ceiling on any kind of restrictions and think we can let each tub sit on its bottom. That is, in my opinion, a mistake.

Mr. MAHON. There are some leaks in Government tubs and we are trying to close some of them.

Mr. RIVERS. I do not deprecate the efforts of the chairman, but I am sure an enlisted man did not pull the seacock on that submarine. It could have been sabotaged.

Mr. MAHON. I do not know who is responsible, but the Navy should find out who is responsible and see that he is adequately disciplined. If they want to gain higher respect, this kind of action must be taken.

Mr. RIVERS. I agree. We must restore responsibility in the military—and then hold them responsible. And let me tell the chairman, our committee is going to investigate that incident and, for whatever it is worth, we are going to report to the Chairman on this.

THE SO-CALLED PEACE DIVIDEND IN FEDERAL FUNDS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee has made a statement which makes it appropriate at this time for me to discuss a further situation.

Many of the programs and ships and weapons of the military are obsolete or are becoming obsolescent. There is no doubt of that. Large programs are going to be necessary to outfit the Navy and the other services with modern ships, aircraft, and other weapons. Defense spending is not going to toboggan downward when the war ends in Vietnam. There will be reductions but the costs will remain high.

Military spending is going to have to remain high because survival is the first law of nations. It is inescapable that the military programs are going to remain high and we are going to have to support them. That is one of the reasons we want a better job done by the military—by civilians and those in uniform—in order that we may get more for the dollar.

But those who are writing in the papers and saying in their speeches, "Wait

until the war is over, and then we will have unlimited resources for all the social programs," are too optimistic. Some seem to think that Secretary Finch will have all the money he wants for education, for health, and the poor, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will have all the money he wants to for housing and related needs.

That is incorrect. They are not going to have all the money they want. There is not enough money in the Nation to meet all these demands.

Besides that, money is not the only answer in defense, and it is not the only answer in our social programs. I think it is a little bit cruel for us to make statements which would lead the cities and the mayors and the poor and others to believe that when the war is over we will have unlimited funds for all purposes which may be desired. We just will not have that kind of money, and let us tell the people that now.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

SUPPLEMENTALS FOR INTEREST SUBSIDY PROGRAMS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said he does not want any exceptions to his limitations provision but, in fact, by not including some of the practices or programs under the limitation, there are exceptions. For example, there is no limit on the amount that they can obligate for interest subsidies. And now it is proposed, instead of having current expenditures within the fiscal year for a direct loan program and grants for college facilities, they will have a program to pay only \$11 million this year and obligate us for \$440 million, which does not show up in this year's budget. So in effect the limitation is no limitation so long as that is permitted, is it?

Mr. MAHON. I wish the gentleman would let his own statement stand as he made it. I am not quite sure of the import of the statement.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. But it does not limit them from obligating us to pay for the next 35 years under these programs.

Mr. MAHON. Oh, I see what the gentleman means and his point is well taken.

I call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) to this matter. Under the housing programs there is a provision in the bill providing authority for \$80 million for subsidies for 1 year. We provide a certain amount for 1 year, but when we do this we obligate ourselves for 40 years.

I believe the gentleman from North Carolina has tabulated the total amount of money in these housing programs that will be mandated as a result of this bill if we pass it. Will the gentleman give that figure?

Mr. JONAS. If the gentlemen will yield, it will be 40 times 80, and that is \$3.2 billion we will be obligating the taxpayers to pay over the 40-year period.

I remind the chairman that already in this fiscal year, we have provided \$50 million for those two programs, so we have to add that to the \$3.2 billion. You

will find in these two programs, sections 235 and 236 of the housing law as amended, we will be obligating the taxpayers of this country to the amount of \$5.2 billion over the 40-year period.

Mr. MAHON. About \$5.2 billion. It looks very minimal when one looks at the bill, but when one looks at the costs which we are obligated to pay over 40 years it is about \$5.2 billion.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. This has been said, but needs to be emphasized. This spending limitation does not purport to remain in effect beyond next year. It is only for 1 year; is that not true?

Mr. MAHON. It is only for 1 year. It might be for only 30 days, if we change it, but this is not proposed for more than 1 year. Next year we can do something similar with respect to fiscal 1971 if we so determine.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. If I might make a further point with respect to the institutions of higher learning and their construction needs, there is \$3.9 million in this bill for interest subsidy, which will construct \$145 million worth of college facilities. If you do not want that, then just wipe out the interest subsidy. It all depends on how much we appropriate in this bill for the interest subsidy, as to where that ceiling goes.

As the gentleman from North Carolina says, this is an expenditure ceiling for just the 1 year, not for 30 or 40 years.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This illustrates my point very well. If they get the \$3.9 million interest subsidy, they will withhold the \$150 million already appropriated for direct loans. That \$150 million would be under the limitation, whereas the \$3.9 million is all of the \$145 million that shows up in the fiscal year. This is a big loophole.

Mr. MICHEL. It is not a permanent loophole if you choose to use that word. It is effective only for this year.

What we are saying is that since we are in such a bind, instead of a direct appropriation of \$145 million for direct loans let us do it by the interest subsidy route, and finance the balance through the private sector.

SCOPE OF PROPOSED EXPENDITURE CEILING FOR 1970

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I should like to commend the gentleman from Texas for a most interesting and enlightening statement. I should like to ask a question on a problem I have dealing with appropriations.

An item in my district which was necessary was not included in the Nixon budget. Under this limitation would it preclude the Nixon administration from

amending the budget and providing an item that is not in the present budget?

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing in this limitation that would preclude the Nixon administration from amending the budget and placing the item in it. There is nothing in this limitation which would preclude Congress from providing the funds for the unbudgeted items. So there is nothing inflexible insofar as the gentleman's problem is concerned in the resolution now before us.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Therefore, if I understand the gentleman correctly, the limitation goes only to the amount and the Congress can act independently or the executive can revise its budget. Is that what the gentleman stated?

Mr. MAHON. I think the point is clear.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not think this is such a novel approach. The Congress considered it before and in effect we have done it before.

Mr. MAHON. I believe we have never done it before, I will say to the gentleman. Not quite.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think we have put a limitation in effect before when we put a limitation, for instance, on the national debt. In effect, we said that there was a limitation on the borrowing budget.

The gentleman will recall that the Hoover Commission recommended and this Congress debated the proposal that limitations on spending be placed upon each governmental department. In other words, taking the overall limitation which you are now proposing and breaking it down. The reason for the spending limitation was that the Congress could then control the expenditure budget, which we do not now control. All we can do here is appropriate the money, and the executive controls the rate of expenditure. The Hoover Commission's proposal, which you are proposing to carry out now, was to put a limitation on what the Congress itself might control. It does not mean that you cannot vary that figure if conditions change which call for it. Congress can vary it. But it is a restraint on additional spending. It also advises the Congress, the way it was originally proposed, and if there were slippages, we could find out why there were, and if there were overages proposed, we could find out why. So it is not so novel.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman in effect is in favor of the limitation?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I certainly am. And I think it should be done even more. We should do it on each department. I wish the chairman had agreed some years ago, along with some other members of the Committee on Appropriations, to place expenditure limitations on Government departments because we could have been doing it all these years and prevented a great deal of the wild spending that we have had.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MAHON. My friend is entitled to

his views. The ceiling should help but holding down authorizations and appropriations is the surest way to cut spending. No one can predict just what Congress will do, but I hope that the proposal here will be well supported by the House and by the other body.

COMPARISON OF TITLE IV OF PENDING BILL WITH THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET PROPOSAL IN THE 1946 REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. Chairman, in elaboration, may I add that the discussion recalls the efforts of the Congress, some 22 years ago, to enact a legislative budget, an important and really key feature of which was to put a ceiling on Government spending. I think it might be useful to insert an analysis comparing that effort with title IV of the pending bill:

By proposing a ceiling on the aggregate of government spending for fiscal 1970, title IV of the pending bill would secure something of what the framers of the legislative budget plan in the 1946 Reorganization Act had in mind, but which Congress in fact never accomplished. It would be useful to recall briefly what that plan was about, refer to the experiences in attempting to carry it out, and make some note of the similarities and dissimilarities between the provisions of the 1946 plan and title IV of the pending bill.

THE 1946 LEGISLATIVE BUDGET PLAN

The legislative budget plan was spelled out in the 1946 law. It is now a part of Rule XLII of the Rules of the House, and reads as follows:

"(a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

"(b) The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: 'That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being \$-----' "

In other words, the joint committee, after study of the budget and consultations otherwise, was to bring in, early in the session, a concurrent resolution proposing an expression of the judgment of the Congress as to the probable budget revenues for the coming fiscal year and fixing a maximum budget expenditure goal for the year.

There was nothing mandatory or compelling about any ceiling so fixed upon.

It was not an enactment requiring approval of the President.

It was to be not a binding statute but only a target for the guidance of the Congress in processing the spending and revenue bills.

It was not directed to the Executive spending agencies, but only to the Congress. In its individual actions in the appropriation and the other spending bills, and on the revenue side, Congress could either hue to the disciplines implicitly suggested by the ceiling thus set, or it could ignore the ceiling.

In the first effort—in 1947—to put the plan into effect, both Houses adopted a concurrent resolution. The House proposed an overall cut of \$6 billion from projected fiscal 1948 budget expenditures. The Senate proposed a \$4.5 billion reduction. The conferees did not resolve the differences and the resolution died in conference. Thus no target ceiling was set.

The next year, Congress, on February 27, 1948, did adopt such a concurrent resolution with respect to fiscal 1949, setting—for itself—the goal of a \$2.5 billion reduction in budgeted expenditures by expressing the judgment, "based upon presently available information", that * * * "expenditures during such fiscal year shall not exceed 37.2 billion dollars * * *".

Actual budget expenditures in fiscal 1949 were \$40 billion; they exceeded the target by \$2.8 billion, in effect wiping out the reduction goal of \$2.5 billion. They exceeded the original budget projection of \$39.7 billion by some \$300 million.

In 1949, a move was made to set the date for action on the legislative budget for fiscal 1950 back from February 15 to May 1. Nothing further happened. Nothing further has been done in direct response to the legislative budget plan.

Many post-mortems have been rendered on the experiment. It was said that the joint committee of 102 members was unwieldy.

It was said that the time limit of February 15 was too short.

It was said that to name an expenditure reduction total in advance in the manner proposed approximated a court rendering a verdict without evidence. It was said that to vote for a blanket reduction in advance of hearings and consideration of the individual budget proposals was a vote to cut without knowing what is to be cut, how much is to be cut, or where the cut is to be made.

It was said that no legislative budget, logically premised, could precede a detailed study of the estimate.

The majority report accompanying the first concurrent resolution submitted to the House in February, 1947, suggesting the goal of a \$6 billion cutback, had this acknowledgment:

"Of course, if the accompanying resolution be adopted there is no commitment as to any reduction in specific items contained in the budget. The resolution expresses an overall objective and its realization depends entirely upon the final action of the Congress upon budget estimates, individually and collectively."

THE 1946 PLAN AND TITLE IV—SIMILARITIES AND DISSIMILARITIES

There are a number of basic differences between the 1946 plan and title IV. There are also some similarities.

Of course, title IV does not deal with the revenue side. The 1946 plan did. But Congress knows what the revenue estimates of the Executive Branch are—although it should be noted that an up-dating of the January figures are needed; the April 15 budget review of President Nixon dealt only with appropriations and spending, not with revenues. The budget surplus of \$5.8 billion projected by President Nixon is subject to revision on that account.

Perhaps the most basic difference between title IV and the spending ceiling in the legislative budget resolutions of 1947 and 1948 is that title IV would legislate a rigid ceiling into law, whereas the earlier resolutions merely sought to set a goal against

which Congress would work in its actions on the various spending bills.

The earlier "ceiling" was not really a ceiling because it was not enacted as a law and was not binding on either Congress or the Executive. Title IV would set a binding statutory ceiling. The ceiling figure, insofar as congressional decision is concerned, is a beginning, not an ending figure. But whatever figure Congress would wind up setting, that would become a maximum on the Executive Branch, changeable only by subsequent action of Congress. That was not the case in the 1947 and 1948 efforts.

Unlike the earlier efforts which sought to declare at the beginning that the spending budget "should" be cut by not less than a pre-determined, arbitrary amount but which was cast in such a way as not to ensure it, title IV would not impose any reduction in advance—either as a "goal" for Congress or as a "ceiling" that would leave to the Executive the allocation of an arbitrary cut to specific agencies and programs.

Unlike King Canute who commanded the tide not to come in but was powerless to ensure it, title IV, unlike the earlier efforts "commands" that expenditures shall not exceed a certain sum and carries the mechanism to ensure the result. Of course, Congress can change tomorrow what it decides today, but that power, as to expenditures, is reserved to Congress by title IV.

Unlike the earlier effort, nothing in title IV calls on Congress to vote for a reduction—either as a "goal" or a "ceiling"—below the President's announced spending budget in advance of individual item consideration. The mechanism is there to adjust the initial ceiling figure—up or down—to comport with what Congress decides on each spending bill and proposition.

Not unlike what the majority report—quoted above—said about final results under the 1947 resolution "goal", what happens under title IV (which adopts the budget figure as a starting point)—. . . "depends entirely upon the final action of the Congress upon budget estimates, individually and collectively".

Like the words used in both the 1947 and 1948 resolutions, title IV is "based upon presently available information". The legislative budget effort was based on the initial budget. Title IV is also based on the initial projection of the new administration.

Like the earlier efforts, title IV encompasses expenditures from unexpended carryover balances of previous appropriations as well as expenditures from appropriations to be newly enacted in this session for fiscal 1970.

And unlike the noble but ineffective and impractical plan of 1946, title IV is a proposal logically based and practical of operation. If adopted and adhered to, it will not only focus on the total of government expenditures, but will keep the hands of Congress on the total. And the potential for retrenchment in expenditures is considerable.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF MILITARY PROGRAMS AND LEADERS

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to return to a matter I mentioned earlier, which is the business of military spending.

As I said in the colloquy with the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RIVERS), I believe in military strength. I believe we can negotiate with the Soviet Union better if we have military strength. I believe our main opponent in the world is not Korea or North Vietnam but the Soviet Union and Red China. I think we have to keep ourselves militarily strong. I do not think we ought to permit those to succeed who are trying to destroy the image of our civilian and uniformed military personnel. It is true our military

establishments have prevented world war III, which was and is the great catastrophic threat that has confronted us since World War II. Our military have won their wars insofar as they were able to do so under all of the facts and circumstances which pertained.

They have reflected great credit upon this country and they have also shown some considerable managerial ability.

It was Admiral Raborn who headed up the Polaris program. In this Polaris program he demonstrated leadership that was incomparable.

It was Admiral Rickover who headed up the development of the atomic submarine program. He has performed a magnificent job in that field.

It was Gen. Ben Schriever who headed up the intercontinental ballistic missiles program of the Air Force.

Many good jobs have been done. There are countless examples of success by our military and civilian leaders. We cannot look only at shortcomings. We must look at the successes also, and we have reason to be proud.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken more time than I had anticipated but I believe it has given the members of the committee an opportunity to propound certain questions about programs in which they are interested.

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I alluded earlier to unexpended carryover balances. The report reflects \$226 billion. I will ask if it is not correct that this \$226 billion unexpended carryover balance, if added to the Nixon budget request for new spending authority of \$205 billion, would not make a total of \$431 billion available for expenditure if the Nixon budget were approved as submitted?

Mr. MAHON. This is right. This \$431 billion would be, technically, available for expenditure in 1970. If we adopted the appropriation or obligational budget proposed by the President, there would be about \$431 billion available in fiscal 1970. But this requires a lot of understanding and analysis before it is intelligible to the average citizen. It is a very complex matter.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, it is a very flexible budget and it is not really putting a crimp on the Bureau of the Budget the \$192.9 billion spending figure is the full amount projected by the Nixon budget review.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

(Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. JONAS) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11400 is the usual supplemental appropriation bill which we have each spring for those items not provided for in our regular appropriations bills approved during the preceding calendar year.

Overall, I think this is a good bill. The committee considered appropriation requests totaling \$4.3 billion, and approved appropriations of \$3.8 billion, thus we cut almost \$600 million below the requested amount. Moreover, the \$4.3 billion request was reduced some \$250 million by the Nixon administration under the amounts requested in the Johnson budget before we considered the request.

While I shall not repeat the detail presented by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), I do want to point out that of the \$3.8 billion provided \$1.2 billion is for military operations in Southeast Asia; \$1.2 billion is for pay increases resulting from the Pay Act of last year; and the balance of \$1.4 billion is for a variety of programs throughout the Government service.

Significant among the amounts provided are the funds requested by the administration to fight crime throughout the United States. This effort to cope with organized crime should be welcomed by all law-abiding citizens. It is my hope that substantial inroads can be made by the Department of Justice and other investigatory and regulatory agencies in coping with the criminal problems which face us.

Although each of the individual chapters in the bill will be handled by the respective ranking Republican Members, I do want to point out that this bill provides for a spending limitation in fiscal 1970 which will restrict budget expenditures to \$192.9 billion. This \$192.9 billion figure is some \$4 billion below the adjusted amounts projected by the Johnson budget.

As we all know, President Nixon had the departments and agencies conduct an extensive review of their financial needs earlier this year, and the President was able to reduce projected expenditures by the aforementioned \$4 billion. As all members of the Committee know, for more than 3½ years I have offered the so-called Bow expenditure limitation amendment on most appropriation bills, and while it was adopted on a number of occasions by the House, in some instances unanimously, it was never approved by the Senate on an individual appropriation bill. However, last year such limitation was included in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 and it has had the effect of reducing projected Federal spending in the current fiscal year by some \$6 billion.

The provision before us which would limit budget expenditures in fiscal 1970 to \$192.9 billion is much more rigid than was the expenditure limitation of last year because a number of budget expenditure items were exempted from the provisions of the limitation last year. Expenditures in the current fiscal year for the war in Vietnam, expenditures for interest on the public debt, those for veterans benefits and compensation, and so forth, were excluded from the limit and their exemption had the effect of increasing spending for exempted programs and in the so-called uncontrollable areas by approximately \$6 billion above original estimates.

For example, interest on the public debt is up \$1.1 billion above the original

estimate of a year ago and farm price support outlays have risen \$1.6 billion above the original estimate of last year.

Of the \$192.9 billion of proposed spending for fiscal 1970, some \$106.3 billion is in the relatively uncontrollable category. That includes \$81.1 billion for uncontrollable civilian programs and \$25.2 billion for special Southeast Asia support. Of the \$81.1 billion for relatively uncontrollable civilian programs \$49 billion is for outlays in the social security and public assistance programs.

Thus it seems to me that the administration will have serious difficulty holding expenditures in fiscal 1970 at \$192.9 billion since there are no exemptions for the uncontrollables such as the war in Vietnam, interest on the public debt, and so forth.

While it is true that expenditures may rise above or fall below the \$192.9 billion ceiling depending upon action or inaction by Congress on requests for appropriations, the ceiling is indeed rigid and leaves little leeway for unexpected changes in budget outlays.

As the ceiling is written in the bill it provides the following:

That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendation thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

If, for example, Congress fails to approve the postal rate increase in the amount of some \$600 million, budget expenditures will rise by that amount since postal receipts are treated as offsets against spending. Similarly, the \$192.9 billion ceiling will rise by \$600 million since the postal rate proposal is accounted for in the expenditure total. But, it also follows that where other uncontrollable expenditures exceed current budget estimates, then expenditures for controllable programs would have to be cut below current estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a good bill in terms of the reductions which we have made in obligatory authority, and I urge favorable action by the House on it. I am somewhat distressed, however, by the rigid ceiling on spending since history clearly shows a wide variation between actual expenditures and those projected in a budget document some 18 months before the close of a given fiscal year.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to 50 minutes of what I believe to be as interesting a discussion of budget problems that I have ever heard in this Chamber. The gentleman from Texas has handled this subject in a masterful way and in my opinion has covered it adequately. Actually, I see no real reason why I should extend the discussion, because I doubt if I can add anything that he has not already covered.

However, there are a few points that I would like to make primarily by way of emphasizing what the gentleman from Texas has said. Actually, this bill contains four separate titles. They will be discussed, undoubtedly, by the chairmen of the various subcommittees that handle those topics and by the ranking minority members who work with them.

In summary, it can be said that in this supplemental bill the committee considered budget requests amounting to \$4.364 billion, reduced that total request by \$580,794,190, and recommend to the House a bill providing for \$3,783,212,766, a reduction of 13 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it is not unusual to hear remarks to the effect that the House Committee on Appropriations marched up the hill last year and cut the budget by \$14 billion and now it is marching down the same hill and restoring nearly \$4 billion of that cut. But, as the chairman has pointed out, only about 1 percent of the funds contained in this bill amount to restoration of funds that were eliminated in the regular bills last year.

The remaining part of the bill covers mandatory increases that have been made necessary because of action taken by the Congress subsequent to the enactment of the appropriation bills last year.

I would like to discuss briefly the title of the bill which covers independent offices, and with particular reference to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, because that subject was raised in the colloquy between the gentleman from Texas and a member of the committee.

It is customary to read in the press that Congress has been very remiss in looking after the problems of the cities; that we have neglected them and that we have spent a lot of money on farm programs and allowed the cities to grow up in slums and what-not. I believe at times such as these that it is appropriate to remind those who read the RECORD, and who report on these deliberations—because it is not necessary to remind the Members of the House, because I am sure they are all familiar with the facts—but to those who are not familiar with the facts, I believe they need to be reminded occasionally that Congress has been pretty generous in spending the taxpayers' money on urban problems.

For example, we have been hearing a lot this afternoon about unexpended balances; and the budget does reflect that there will be on hand at the end of 1969 \$226 billion in unexpended funds. But I do not believe it has been mentioned—and this is the most significant part of that figure—that \$139,238,000,000 of that total is not even obligated. The total of \$226 billion includes unspent and unobligated funds, but there is approximately \$140 billion in the hands of the executive branch of the Government in previously appropriated funds which have not even been obligated, or will not be obligated at the end of fiscal 1969.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has on hand—or will have at the end of this year—\$20 billion of

previously appropriated money which has not been spent. Some of it has been obligated, but it will have \$13.5 billion of unobligated funds at the end of this year.

We have appropriated to that Department nearly \$1 billion since 1967—\$948 million, to be exact, for the new model cities program, and very little of it has been spent. They announced nine grants a few months ago, and over the last week-end three more were announced.

I do not know what causes the delay. I know it took the previous Secretary of Housing and Urban Development 7 months after he had all of the plans in to even select the first group of cities.

So I do not believe Congress can be justly charged with any lack of a sense of urgency about these problems. I believe much of the delay can be attributed to paper shuffling, foot dragging and bureaucracy in the department.

Let me tell you in brief capsule form some of the programs Congress has funded for the aid of cities.

Urban renewal is one of the important ones. Do you know that through 1969 the Congress has provided HUD and its predecessor with \$4.6 billion for urban renewal? Through 1969 the Congress has provided nearly \$3 billion public housing subsidies? Let me show you how the cost of the subsidy for public housing is increasing as the years go by.

The total was \$208 million in 1965.

It went up to \$241 million in 1966.

It went to \$261 million in 1967.

Then to \$295 million in 1968.

It went to \$350 million, plus a \$16 million supplemental or to \$366 million in 1969.

The 1970 budget calls for \$473 million.

New public housing starts are scheduled at 130,000 in 1970.

We have the rent supplement program.

We have the homeownership program, and we have the rental subsidy program.

We have the housing for the elderly and the rehabilitation program.

We have the below-market interest program and we have the community facilities program; the open-space land programs.

You name them—there are about 70 different programs in the Department of Housing and Urban Development being funded by the Congress from funds extracted from all of the taxpayers of the United States—70 different programs operated by one Department of the Government, in various aid to the cities.

Yet we are accused of doing nothing.

The truth of the matter is that we are spending about \$30 billion a year on urban problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in a colloquy with the chairman earlier, I responded to the question as to what brandnew programs we are funding in this supplemental and what they will cost—and I refer now to the programs under section 235, that is the homeownership program, a program under which the Government will subsidize the interest for a homeowner who wishes to buy a house and cannot pay the interest charges.

The subsidy will amount to the interest which exceeds 1 percent. So if the current interest rate is 7½ percent, the Government will subsidize it at no more than 6½ percent.

We put in the regular bill last year \$25 million in contract authority for that program, and we are including in the supplemental an additional \$40 million in contract authority. That is \$65 million that is being voted this fiscal year for this new program which is just getting under way. That contract authority simply means that we give the department authority to commit the Government to spend \$65 million a year on homeownership interest subsidies for 40 years—or \$2.6 billion.

There is a companion program under section 236, known as the rental housing assistance program, which carried the same figure of \$25 million in the regular bill and another \$40 million in this supplemental. So under these two sections, these two new programs, in addition to public housing and in addition to urban area and in addition to community facilities and in addition to all of these other programs—here are two additional programs that are going to cost—even if we do not ever give them another dime in future years—that are going to cost the taxpayers \$5.2 billion.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is pursuing a very interesting aspect of Federal spending. I hope that he will place in the RECORD in connection with his remarks, if the figures have been assembled—and I know the gentleman's subcommittee has asked for them—the continuing costs that are mandated by previous actions on all these various housing-type programs, rent supplements, and so forth.

The reason I make this request is that there are those who feel that Congress is losing control of the purse. I think we are not losing control of the purse at all. When we appropriate money, we expect it to be spent for the programs which we have endorsed. In the past we have not tried to fix a rate of expenditure of the funds which we have provided for various programs except to a limited degree, which we discussed earlier. But if you approve a series of long-term programs and you grant the first down payment on a 40-year program, then for 40 years the Government is committed to that particular expenditure, because it is fixed by an action of the Congress. It is done by Congress. It is not a loss of control by Congress in the beginning, but we lock just that much more into the fixed and subsequently uncontrollable area of expenditure.

I would like to have the gentleman's views on that matter.

Mr. JONAS. I certainly agree with the chairman, and I believe he would agree with me that we ought to begin giving closer scrutiny to requests for contract authority. That is where the process begins. We cannot keep up with what is going on unless, as we grant contract authority, we know how long that authority is to extend and the total

amount that will be involved, because when we grant contract authority, what we do is to pile up mandatory appropriations over the period of the contract. Some of those contracts go for 35 years, most of them for 40 years. What we are doing here, in funding Sections 235 and 236, is a clear example of the mistake we make when we talk about appropriating \$80 million when the cost of the program is \$3.2 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Between the statements of the distinguished chairman of the committee and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, we are almost drowned in figures concerning this bill, and it is proper that the chairman and the gentleman from North Carolina give us the figures contained in this bill. But let me see if I can get a small-sized handle on this big spending proposal in this way: This bill provides for a ceiling of \$192,900,000,000, is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. What are the total estimated expenditures for this fiscal year? In other words, this bill would fix a ceiling of \$192.9 billion for fiscal 1970. What will be the amount spent in this fiscal year which ends on June 30?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. MAHON. The expenditure for this year will be about \$185 billion. So, under the administration's expenditure projection, expenditures would go up by \$8 billion, 1970 over 1969, and appropriations would go up by about \$10 billion.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman refers to the \$192.9 billion. Does that include the expenditures that he is giving the House now for the present fiscal year? Does that include the \$3.8 billion in this supplemental?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; the \$3.8 billion is all within these figures.

Mr. GROSS. They definitely include the \$3.8 billion in this supplemental?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Iowa made that point, because I did not want to forget to remind the committee that if we adopt the recommendations of our committee with respect to the spending limitation, that will not be the end. We are going to have to work hard on every single appropriation bill to make reductions, because otherwise any reductions that are made will have to be made by the executive branch of the Government. There are Members of this body who do not want to give him the discretion or authority to decide where cuts shall be made. So we reserve the right, if we do our duty and live up to our responsibility and do not abdicate to the President the authority to make these cuts, to make the cuts in subsequent appropriation bills for fiscal year 1970 as they come before the House for adoption.

We cannot just adopt this spending limitation and then sit back and rub-

berstamp all the appropriation bills, and we do not intend to do it, but we have to have some support on this floor.

I have already heard rumors that efforts are going to be made to increase the Nixon budget. While the majority leader in the other body is making statements that spending should be reduced \$10 billion below the Nixon budget. And, there are people on this side of the Capitol who are saying already that the spending cuts are too deep. I think it is true, as it has been in all but 3 of the last 14 years, that spending has been underestimated by whoever was in the White House, and I think spending this year in the 1970 budget is underestimated. I am sure it is underestimated in the interest on the national debt and in some other areas also.

I agree with the Chairman that this is not going to be any sweet pill for the administration to swallow. It is something that the administration would like to avoid, I am sure. I certainly would not want to have to live under this limitation if I were the Executive or if I were his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but they understand full well that they have the responsibility of trying their dead-level best to live up to these spending limitations, and they are going to have to live up to them unless Congress should unwisely I think exceed the budget requests on some appropriation bills.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I do so merely to make the point that I agree again with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) that we cannot emphasize too strongly the necessity for watching the authorization bills as they come in.

In that regard, I am not aware of a single authorization bill that has been approved so far in this session of Congress that has not carried an increase in spending. Is the gentleman aware of an authorization bill that has not been increased?

Mr. JONAS. I am aware of the fact that one adopted on the floor of this House a few days ago was substantially above the budget.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of a single one that has not provided for an increased outlay of money.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from Iowa is correct. That is the first place to start. The second place to start is within the Appropriations Committee, and I think we are going to bring some substantial cuts here for the consideration of the House, and we are going to ask for the Members' cooperation as we undertake to make some substantial reductions this year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LIPSCOMB).

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the need for supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1969 has been recognized as needed and required for many months.

The Committee on Appropriations in their report dated July 19, 1968, No.

1735 on the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969, discussed the budgetary effect of the war in Vietnam and the possibility of added funds. The report stated:

It is probable that the funds provided will not be entirely adequate through the end of the current fiscal year and that a supplemental request will be made in the next session of Congress. This has been the case in the past several years.

The committee in their report also informed the House that funds were not included for military or civilian pay increases which became effective July 1, 1968. The committee report when discussing other fiscal considerations stated:

In accordance with longstanding custom, this bill does not include funds for the military and civilian pay increase for fiscal year 1969, which became effective this month. There will be, as has been the case in the past, a supplemental estimate presented to the next session of Congress covering such costs government-wide.

On September 11, 1968, when the fiscal year 1969 bill was before the House of Representatives, I remarked on the need for added appropriations as follows:

It should also be noted that the Department of Defense will require additional fiscal year 1969 funds in order to meet present requirements, particularly in Southeast Asia. A supplemental request will be required. This has been the case in the past several years. Known increases already indicate consumption of certain specific ammunition items has greatly increased. Force deployments already approved are in excess of those upon which the budget was based. If the war continues at the present rate of expenditure of material, other costs will rise. The military and civilian pay increases which went into effect July 1, 1968, are not included in the budget now before the House.

The additional new obligational authority recommended in this second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969, H.R. 11400, now before the House, for the Department of Defense, in titles I, II, and III is a net total of \$2,312,068,000.

These additional funds are required to support United States and our allies military operations in Southeast Asia. Funds are included for the pay of military personnel, for operation and maintenance, and for procurement of items to replace combat losses. The total request also includes funds for military and civilian pay increases already implemented under provisions of previously enacted laws and mandatory increases in military retired pay.

The supplemental budget estimates for fiscal year 1969 for the Department of Defense as proposed and transmitted to the Congress by President Johnson, January 17, 1969 totaled \$3,011,900,000. A reassessment by President Nixon's administration was completed in April and the revised estimate to Congress totaled \$2,871,200,000 a reduction of \$140,700,000. The Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Defense after devoting considerable time to analyzing the request, recommended a further reduction of \$559,132,000. The \$2,312,068,000 total recommended in this bill represents a total decrease of \$699,832,000 below the January 17, 1969 estimate.

For title I the revised estimates for military operations in Southeast Asia

totaled \$1,496,900,000. The committee reduced this amount by \$262,900,000 and recommends appropriations totaling \$1,234,000,000.

In title II the committee recommends appropriations totaling \$226,050,000, a reduction of \$23,632,000 below the revised request of \$249,682,000. The largest part of the funds requested in this title, \$175,000,000, is for "Retired pay, military." The requirement for additional funds results from increased benefits paid in accordance with cost of living allowances previously authorized by law.

The balance of the appropriations in title II is funding for increased per diem costs for reservists in travel status based on a new law, Public Law 90-168, premium pay and employee benefits for National Guard technicians, depot overhaul of Guard equipment and aircraft, and funds for training and other operational costs.

Under title III there is recommended \$852,018,000 for military and civilian pay increases. This is a reduction of \$272,600,000 below the revised request. The subcommittee reduced all requests for funds to meet increased pay costs as the requests were estimated on the total annual requirements which were based on first quarter obligations. Many of the estimates have been proven to be overstated at this point in time.

The gross amount recommended for the Department of Defense in this bill for military and civilian pay increases under titles I and II is \$903,768,000. Of this amount \$678,950,000 is for military pay and \$224,818,000 is for civilian pay. The additional pay costs and added funds stem from the second phase comparability pay adjustments effective last July 1. These increases were authorized in Public Law 90-206, the Federal Salary Act of 1967, and Public Law 90-207, increasing the basic pay for members of the uniformed services.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Defense spent considerable time in analyzing the request for the funds requested to be assured that only those additional funds actually required were recommended. We feel that the funds which are included in this bill are needed and the appropriation should be approved.

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

President Johnson's budget for fiscal year 1969 submitted in January, 1968, proposed defense expenditures for support of Vietnam operations in the amount of \$25.8 billion. It was known during 1968 that figure was a low estimate.

The present estimate for military operations in Vietnam for fiscal year 1969 is \$28.8 billion in expenditures. This amount includes the estimates submitted in connection with the pending bill.

In January of this year the supplemental requirement for fiscal year 1969 in support of military operations in Vietnam was estimated at \$1.632 billion. The reassessment which the new administration completed in April confirmed the validity of the requirement but reduced the funds requested to \$1.497 billion.

The committee, in the bill before us, recommends \$1.234 billion in funds for

military operations in Southeast Asia which provides:

	Millions
For additional personnel pay costs—	\$239.5
For operational support and maintenance of equipment—	354.4
For procurement of ammunition and ground force equipment—	640.1
Total	1,234.0

These additional requirements result directly from factors and events not contemplated when the fiscal year 1969 budget was prepared.

First, in January 1968 the Communist Tet offensive required the deployment of additional forces to Vietnam and required increased support operations, additional equipment, ammunition, and other consumables. Losses sustained were great and material had to be repaired or replaced.

Second, the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and other aggressive actions by the North Koreans resulted in the callup of Reserve Forces to meet the possible military threat, deployment of additional air and sea forces to the area, additional equipment, and other requirements.

This request now before us does not provide for increases to our current force levels which are somewhat below the presently authorized deployment of 549,500.

The committee procurement recommendation provides equipment and consumables for American and Allied ground forces and also to upgrade our production base. More than 65 percent of the procurement funds—\$419.5 million—is for ammunition.

The operation and maintenance appropriations require supplemental appropriations for Reserve callup and additional deployment, maintenance of material, aircraft fuel and oil and increases and modernization of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Vietnam.

Included in this supplemental are additional funds for the modernization and upgrading of the South Vietnamese Armed Forces. This is a very significant part of this supplemental bill.

President Nixon on Wednesday, May 14, said that the strengthening of the South Vietnamese forces has been speeded up and the President said:

That time is approaching when South Vietnamese forces will be able to take over some of the fighting fronts now being manned by Americans.

The funds in this bill will directly aid the speed up of the strengthening of the South Vietnamese forces.

Significantly this bill as recommended by the committee includes a total of \$246.4 million in funds which are for purposes which will enable the South Vietnamese to eventually defend themselves and thus to gain the opportunity to determine their own future.

Funds are included to procure for the South Vietnamese Armed Forces ammunition and equipment such as armored cars, trucks, rifles, communications, and electronic devices. Also included are funds for South Vietnamese training, as well as general supplies, spare parts, transportation, and depot operations associated with the major end items provided the South Vietnamese.

We must welcome the effective assumption by South Vietnamese forces of a larger share of combat operations for certainly our overall national interests do dictate that we begin reductions of U.S. forces as soon as is feasible and that our forces not remain in substantial number indefinitely if a negotiated settlement proves unattainable.

It is clear the administration requires the additional defense funds to meet our commitment in Southeast Asia and other already incurred obligations as provided in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has made every effort in deleting unessential items and funds not related to Southeast Asia military operations as well as correcting estimates which were overstated.

The funds recommended are necessary and should be appropriated.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, there is a portion of this bill to which I would like to address myself, and it is that having to do with the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. This involves \$700 million of the bill, broken down as follows: \$35.9 million for the Department of Labor and \$677 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The first item having to do with the Department of Labor is a \$20 million item for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.

The members of the committee will recall that earlier in the year we passed a supplemental in the amount of \$36 million. This will be in addition to that in order to rectify those faulty estimates that were submitted to us at the beginning of fiscal year 1969.

Then, too, there is also an item of \$15.9 million for employees' compensation, claims and expenses. Now, both of these items are mandatory payments required by law. Both were set up by the Nixon administration, because the previous estimates, as I said, were too low.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be borne in mind that compensation benefits paid to surviving children are involved in this particular item. Back in 1966 when we amended the law we provided that full-time students could receive payments until the age of 23; whereas, before they were cut off at the age of 18. We were told in our testimony that these payments to these children average \$110 a month or \$1,320 per year per child. This is one of the factors which goes into this increase.

Then, too, there is an item for the cost-of-living increase, and an increase in the maximum monthly allowance from \$525 to better than three times that amount, \$1,600. That amount has led to many of our Federal employees choosing workmen's compensation instead of sick leave. An injured employee has the choice or option to use sick leave or receive compensation. Twelve years ago only about 37 percent of our injured em-

ployees chose to use the compensation route rather than choosing sick leave. But today that figure is practically reversed to 57 percent of the employees using compensation rather than sick leave.

In the area of higher education the first item of interest is that of interest subsidy grants in the amount of \$3,920,000. This will initiate a new program of debt service grants authorized in the higher education amendments that we passed last year.

That was Public Law 90-575, signed into law October 16, 1968. It replaces the same amount of direct Federal loans permitting a substantial reduction in Federal expenditures for fiscal years 1969 and 1970, as we pointed out earlier in our colloquy on the subject with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH). The Federal Government in this program pays the difference between the 3-percent interest rate and the going rate—and incidentally, in the fiscal year 1970 budget there is an item for interest subsidy in the amount of \$10,670,000, which will provide for an increase then of \$6,750,000 for fiscal year 1970. Obviously this manifests itself in a greater construction of facilities at our institutions of higher learning in the years to come.

Incidentally, they told us in our hearings that there are applications on file for in excess of \$200 million worth of construction. As I said, this \$3.9 million will give us \$145 million of construction this first year.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I believe the gentleman is approximately correct. We have the same problem in our bill in our subcommittee in funding HUD's requests. It is a lot better, I believe, to provide assistance with interest payments than for the Federal Government to go into the money market and compete with business enterprises and individuals for the available credit, and thus put our fiscal house more in disorder than is already the case.

Mr. MICHEL. I believe the gentleman from North Carolina makes a good point. Of course, Congress so expressed itself when we passed this law in October of 1968 providing for this.

I might say that this year we have about 6 million college students, and the projection is that in 1970 we will have 10 million students at our institutions of higher learning, so the need for the construction of facilities is paramount.

There is also an item in here of \$7,241,000. This is for the Federal City College, a direct payment, or a one-lump-sum payment to the Federal City College in the District of Columbia. This was the amount authorized in Public Law 90-354 as a one-time lump-sum appropriation in lieu of a land grant for the Federal City College in the District of Columbia. We were told that this sum will at the moment be invested in Government bonds to realize a return of some \$360,000 for the Federal City College of the District of Columbia to be used

for salaries and other expenses of the university.

I might say, too, that over and above this the Federal City College will also receive a share of the annual appropriation for land-grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act, and that allotment in fiscal year 1970 will be approximately \$168,000, out of a total figure of something like \$12 million for the entire country. So here we are for fiscal year 1970 giving the District of Columbia a proportionate cut of the shares that normally go to the other 50 States.

Then too under the second Morrill Act the Federal City College would come in for another share of \$50,000 out of the total allotment of \$2,600,000 for the country.

In the item of the public health service, comprehensive health planning and services, there is an item of \$128,000 for increased pay under Public Law 90-206 and 207. \$9,600,000, the biggest item here, is for a program to combat German measles, better known as Rubella, the 3-day type of measles. We have now been told that an effective vaccine has been developed and is expected to be licensed within the very near future.

What we are doing here is actually a forward funding so that we will not have to wait to get this program underway until the normal appropriation bill can be passed later in the year.

Incidentally, to give you some idea of the proportions of the problem here, there is expected to be another epidemic either this year or next year. If we look back to the last Rubella epidemic that we had in 1964, there were some 20,000 children born with defects. The testimony before our committee states that this will cost us in the end some \$2.8 million in medical costs without even considering the rehabilitation costs for these poor children, the 20,000 or more who were born with deformities of one kind or another as a result of that Rubella epidemic in 1964.

So it is a very worthwhile project and one which should go forward immediately.

Then for District of Columbia medical facilities there is an item here of some \$15 million. This is a portion of the amount authorized under Public Law 90-457 for grants and loans to construct hospitals and other medical facilities in the District of Columbia.

The item was included in the 1970 appropriation bill but we moved it forward here in this supplemental to enable hospitals in the District of Columbia to move ahead with their construction which is already underway.

We have been told there are some very serious financial troubles among the various hospitals here in the District of Columbia.

This is a very worthwhile item.

The biggest item in this supplemental consists of HEW and has to do with grants to States for public assistance. This is a total of \$651,546,000. This figure merges together three appropriation requests—maintenance payments to States in the amount of \$343,524,000 and this is \$30 million under their request. Although we were told in the testimony that this is a legitimate figure now that

adjustments have been made in the States and that is a bona fide figure.

If you add this supplemental to what we have appropriated in the 1969 regular bill of \$3,051,900,000, you have a total amount of payments to States for public assistance for maintenance alone an aggregate of \$3,395,424,000.

The second item is for medical assistance in this supplemental for \$278,022,000.

If you add that to the original appropriation in 1969 of \$2,118,300,000—we have a total in this item for the fiscal year of 1969 of \$2,396,322,000 or a grand total in this fiscal year 1969 in grants to the States of \$5,791,746,000. For the fiscal year 1970—and hold on to your hats—it is going up again—the projections are that it will be \$6,600,000,000.

The reasons they gave us for the increased payments are—and these are all required by law—the deferral of the AFDC—that was pushed back as you will recall; the increased average payments; the increases in the number of recipients; the increased use of intermediate care facilities; then finally the rising medical costs.

So this is an astronomical figure that we are talking about here in these grants to the States for public assistance and something certainly has to be done to reorient this whole program or else we are going to have to shoot the moon in the future to come up with sufficient funds to cover these programs that have been authorized.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN).

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, inquiries have been made about chapter VI, the Interior and related agencies section of the supplemental bill, particularly in regard to additional funding for the increased production of timber.

There is \$610,000 provided in chapter VI to accelerate timber production in the fiscal year 1969 on national forest and Indian lands as part of the national effort to increase the timber supply and thus ameliorate the current shortage which has contributed materially to the increased price of lumber. Of that amount, \$150,000 is provided for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and \$460,000 is for the U.S. Forest Service. It is estimated this will produce an additional 75 million board feet from the BIA forests and an additional 270 million board feet from the U.S. Forest Service lands.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am very glad that the gentlewoman from Washington made that explanation, because the timber shortage, I am told, is quite acute. It is very appropriate that we open up these lands for the scientific production of timber. I am very glad indeed that the record will show that these steps are being taken and that additional timber will be made available.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I thank the distinguished gentleman from North

Carolina. May I add that in the regular hearings of the committee for fiscal year 1970, volume 3, on the U.S. Forest Service, you will find an excellent discussion between the U.S. Forest Service and the committee on timber requirements and the funds that need to be spent in the national forests. You will also find similar discussions with the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs in our 1970 hearings. The funding in this supplemental bill, \$610,000, is just "a piece of adhesive tape" to meet the total problem before us. I assure you the committee in its consideration and markup of the regular 1970 bill intends to provide the maximum funds possible for the increased production of timber.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

(Mr. LANGEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this brief time merely to call to the attention of the House the items that are in the supplemental bill relating to the Department of Agriculture. There are just four items, each of which is demanded because of an emergency, or because of mandatory provisions which require the expenditures, which is the true purpose of the supplemental appropriation bill, in my estimation.

The first item is a matter of \$1,400,000, which is needed in order to combat a very serious outbreak of screw-worm in the Southwest part of the United States, which we were unable to forecast during the course of the regular appropriations for the fiscal year 1969. This amount of money has actually already been spent. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has the authority to authorize these expenditures in order to meet the emergency, and for that reason they have to be reimbursed at this time.

In addition, there is an item of \$218,000 which is to meet the mandatory Federal contribution to the retirement fund for the State extension personnel. These payments are related to the increased funds provided by the Congress in the regular 1969 appropriation bill to place the extension jobs on a salary basis more comparable with other agricultural personnel.

Then there is an item of \$7,500,000, which is necessary in order to meet the regular sugar beet payments, which is a mandatory payment that must be made. The increased moneys become necessary because the crop last year was greater than the estimate.

There are also increased pay costs necessary to be paid. They total more than approximately \$28 million, but there is only \$12,900,000 which is provided by supplemental appropriations. \$10 million is provided by releases from Public Law 90-364 reserves, and another \$5,182,000 is provided by transfers from funds within the Department.

Probably the most significant item within this supplemental appropriation as it relates to the Agriculture Department is the transfer of \$25 million out of unobligated funds from the FHA direct

loan account to the emergency credit revolving fund. This becomes necessary in order to meet the emergency needs for credit. Some very unusual demands have been placed upon this emergency fund because of floods that have occurred throughout the Midwest, in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Illinois, Missouri, California, and several other places. The demands are such that they are necessary in order to keep farm operations going during this coming fiscal year.

In view of the fact that the Department is out of money in this category now, it becomes most essential that these moneys are provided by a transfer from the direct loan account, and requiring also that the account be repaid as the loans are repaid.

I am sure it will be provide much needed relief to a great many farmers who otherwise would find themselves in economic distress were it not for this appropriation.

In conclusion, let me say that each of these items is essential and necessary to the proper operation of the Department of Agriculture. I can very heartily recommend them to the House for approval.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER).

(Mr. SHRIVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I support and the minority members support the committee's recommendation for supplemental appropriations for the Cuban refugee program. The committee recommends the appropriation of \$2,700,000 of the \$2,853,000 requested in new obligational authority, and the release of \$35,000 of the \$38,000 in requested transfers from the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act reserves.

The requested increase for this program will fund the following activities:

There is \$1,254,000 for unanticipated welfare costs of refugees resettled outside the Miami area, due to the higher number of refugees requiring such assistance. The Federal Government has a commitment to reimburse the various States for these welfare expenditures.

There is \$755,000 for increased per-pupil rates for Cuban children in the Dade County, Fla., school system. This increase is due to increased operating costs to the Dade County system because of higher teacher salaries and other costs. These per-pupil rates will be studied again when the committee considers the fiscal 1970 budget requests.

There is \$844,000 for costs of transporting refugees from Cuba to Miami. Last year, Congress included language in the fiscal 1969 appropriation bill to fund this expense from this account, instead of the State Department account as had been the case in the past. It was hoped at the time that these costs could be absorbed by the program, but this has not occurred, thus these funds are necessary.

Although the committee is recommending the appropriation of most of this request, I think it would be well to point out the rapidly increasing cost of the Cuban refugee program. In fiscal 1968, Congress appropriated \$49 million for this program; in fiscal 1969, including this supplemental, this figure had increased to \$70.7 million; and the committee now has pending before it a request for fiscal 1970 of \$87.3 million.

This represents an increase of \$38.3 million, or 78 percent, for the Cuban refugee program in only 2 years. The American people have been very generous with this program through the years, and our country has benefited from the influx of these energetic and enthusiastic immigrants. At the same time, we should be aware of these growing costs. In an effort to insure the most efficient operation possible for this program, the committee has recommended a decrease of \$153,000 from the request for new obligational authority. It is expected that the administrators of this program can program these cutbacks to continue the effectiveness of their operations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, first let me touch on the immediate thrust of the military sector of this bill. It is designed to provide weapons and equipment to strengthen the South Vietnamese forces; to permit these forces to assume a greater share of the burden of battle. This is most important. The South Vietnamese forces are showing greater capability and their battle effectiveness is much more encouraging. It would appear that American forces will no longer have to carry such a great part of the conflict and significantly, the South Vietnamese will be in stronger position to enforce peace when it comes. This is a very meaningful change in the overall picture.

As we consider overall additional expenditures for defense purposes, we find ourselves buffeted by conflicting winds from many sources. There is a taxpayers' revolt against high levels of spending by Government and of course the principal offender from the standpoint of the number of dollars involved is the military. This is an inevitable part of the inflation that we in Government have helped to build; have almost permitted to get out of hand. The cost of weapons and equipment is fantastically high and the costs of development of a new weapons system is even higher because of the unknown factors which are encountered. There have been a series of blunders, some of them colossal, which have shaken the faith of the people in the military and indeed in Congress and the Government. There was the TFX—the F-111 series—which was to be Mr. McNamara's great contribution and a great money saver. In the final analysis, it cost about twice as much as had been anticipated and, in some phases, has been junked. Just a few days ago, a new submarine sank at its dock while being fitted for service. It is absolutely incon-

ceivable that such carelessness in workmanship could have or would have been permitted.

There is the usual flap about the dangers of chemical and biological weapons which always is good for column after column of horror stories in the liberal elements of the press. What they do not print is that the Russians have seven or eight times our capability in this field, and that we could be dangerously exposed in time to a Russian attack with these weapons as an alternative to a nuclear confrontation. In the field of nuclear weapons, we can at least trade destructiveness.

The question of the ABM has been greatly overplayed. It is a simple case of survival for our nuclear weapons capability. I have felt that at least equal protection should have been provided for people in cities but apparently in an effort to negate the antivotes, the administration has cut back on the scope and purpose of the ABM. Both aspects should have been approved.

In other words, we in America find ourselves completing the cycle we have seen on so many other occasions in our country. The commentators tell us that people are getting tired of war—that they want it ended—and that they want no more involvement in foreign affairs. They are saying in effect that we want to retreat to the security of our own continent. All of this is more than a little disconcerting. I do not believe this fallacy is reflected in the thinking of the average American. I believe that a substantial majority of the American people know why we are fighting in Vietnam. They want this war won. They do not want us walking away from Vietnam with our tail between our legs, setting the tragic stage for another war when the Communists get ready for another takeover of territory and peoples.

Our first mistake was in trying too hard to fight this war without inconveniencing anyone—to fight it so that we could have both guns and butter. It is never possible to fight a war without inconveniencing someone. The fact of 35,000 being killed in a war which is not yet resolved attest to the fallacy of this approach in the Vietnamese conflict. The people should have been told why we were fighting. They should have been shown that it is in America's best interests to fight now and win rather than to risk having all of the Pacific fall into Communist hands in the years to come. We should have been told that it is patriotic to wear the uniform, patriotic to be proud of the flag, patriotic to stand up for our country. Because this was not done, the antiwar crowd has had a field day, with the Communists happily at work stirring up anti-American sentiment at every point.

As a part of this pattern, attacks are now being leveled at our military leadership. Unfortunately, this too has always been a part of the American way of conducting its affairs. When those in uniform are winning wars for us, they are our heroes. When we no longer need them, we pick them to pieces. The fact that many people now believe it is administration policy to get out of Vietnam regardless of the cost in strengthening

the efforts of every person who seeks the eventual downfall of the American system of government.

The uncertainty which is sweeping America is not confined to defense. It goes much broader. It involves the whole spectrum of national security, and in this I include all of the unrest which is reflected in the news media day after day and which in too many instances is promoted by them.

We here in the House of Representatives have our responsibility. It has not changed because there is wholesale attack upon the military, or because there is concern about the cost of spending, or because people are tired of taxes. We have a responsibility to insure that those who fight our battles in Vietnam, under whatever orders they fight, receive insofar as it is possible for us to do so, every single item that they need. We have the responsibility of demonstrating to the world that we are determined that this Nation shall not, if we can avoid it, become defenseless in the years ahead. We have a responsibility to demonstrate that there is solidarity in Government, and that we will confront communism everywhere with determination. Don't think for a moment that the Communists are not watching what is happening here on the floor of the House of Representatives today. Do not think for a moment that they are not noting loud and clear what we say and what we do. I do not think I need to remind those here today that we could, by responsible action, help set the stage to throw away in Paris what the uniformed services have fought for on the battlefields of Vietnam. We could throw away whatever chance is left for success in this long, terrible and costly struggle.

Those who say that America has lost the war or cannot win it, do our country a great disservice, for neither is true. By their steadfastness on the battlefield, America's fighting forces have brought the Communists to the point where they want peace. Now they are trying to achieve at the conference table what they could not achieve on the battlefield. More than ever, there is reason for unity at home and for a show of strength for America in this body, which really speaks with the voice of the American people.

One of the items of great interest is the ABM. The question of deployment of this system should be resolved without further controversy. I hope the House will follow with me some comments from informed sources on the real function and the need for an ABM system. For instance there are those who urge continuing research and development—and not deployment. The principal purpose of ABM under the present proposal is to offer protection, as needed, to our deterrent forces.

As Secretary Laird points out:

Simply continuing research and development on the ABM without any initial deployment, would leave us with no option to provide defense to our deterrent on the schedule that might be required by the Soviet threat if we do not reach an agreement with the Soviets on limiting strategic forces.

Before and since Secretary McNamara first included defense of our strategic deterrent as an option of the Sentinel sys-

tem, there has been a substantial body of testimony supporting the effectiveness of this type of deployment.

Dr. Harold Brown said in testifying before the House Armed Services Committee in 1967:

Because our missile sites are small hardened targets, they are much easier to defend than cities. The exchange ratio is favorable to us for the defense of this type of target.

Dr. Edward Teller said in a recent U.S. News & World Report interview:

Twelve years ago it seemed that a missile defense was 30 times as expensive as an offense. Today the ratio is estimated at 3 to 1, although still in favor of offense. In some respects it is even estimated at 1 to 1. The main point is we don't really know. We can't find out except by actual deployment.

In rebutting recent unfavorable comment on the feasibility of defending Minuteman sites against a heavy threat, Dr. Foster made the following comment:

Various estimates of the cost of an interceptor including its assigned fraction and the radar and other systems costs have varied between \$2.5 million and \$7 million. The present cost to the U.S. and probably the Soviet Union for an offensive R/V is in excess of \$10 million. The advances which we expect in our forces over the next few years may reduce these to about \$3 million. . . . In other words, the cost to attack and to defend in the 1970 time frame are roughly one to one.

Moreover, those who are responsible for our national defense have said that now is the time to get on with the deployment of the Safeguard system to defend our Minuteman sites. I agree.

Secretary Laird said before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 21 of this year:

We cannot delay the decision beyond this budget that we presented to this Congress, covering the program for fiscal year 1970, which begins on July 1, 1969. We must include this deployment on two sites in this particular budget.

He had earlier said:

We have sufficient strength today in the combination of our strategic forces—our missiles, our bombers, and our Polaris capability—to respond to any attack that might be launched against the United States.

As Secretary of Defense, it is my obligation and my intention to keep it that way beyond any reasonable doubt. This is what the ABM discussion is all about.

And that is why we have no alternative but to protect our options to safeguard our deterrent forces. If the Soviet threat turns out to be, as the evidence strongly indicates, an attempt to erode our deterrent capability, we must be in a position to convince them that a first strike would always involve unacceptable risks.

In addition, and again quoting Secretary Laird:

Safeguard . . . offers protection, as needed, of the entire country from a small attack, such as the kind of attack that could be possibly delivered by the Chinese Communists during the decade of the 1970's or from an accidental launch.

The estimate of our intelligence community is that the earliest the Red Chinese could have this kind of capacity would be in the 1972-73 time period, and the estimate is that in the time period of 1975 and beyond, that the Red Chinese could have the capacity and the capability to have 15 or more missiles.

Dr. Edward Teller, in U.S. News & World Report, said:

A small nuclear force such as they will have in a few years could wreak real havoc on an undefended United States. We might have to give in to Chinese demands affecting not only South Vietnam but also Taiwan and even Japan, rather than take the slightest risk of their not bluffing.

In regard to the Sentinel system as a defense against the Chinese threat, Secretary McNamara stated July 1967:

This austere defense could probably preclude damage in the 1970's almost entirely.

Dr. Foster stated more recently—on May 12, 1969:

The Safeguard system has been designed by competent people, and the best that are available. Its design has been reviewed by outside experts. Those who do, in fact, study the aspects of the system that are within their area of technical expertise are convinced it will do what it is designed to do. There are some eminent scientists who, for one reason or other, claim it won't work. On that I'd like to say . . . that they have offered no problem which we have not long since addressed and resolved."

Finally Under Secretary Packard stated on March 14, 1969:

Locating sites away from major cities should make clear to the Soviet Union that the American defense is designed to preserve our deterrent—not to change the strategic balance.

It has been suggested in some quarters that the administration has somehow misled Congress about its intentions in deploying the Safeguard system.

I think it is useful to review the letter of the law here.

The current authorizations for the ABM defense system for procurement, research and development and military construction for the Army read as follows:

Public Law 90-500, for procurement:

SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1969 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows: . . . For missiles: for the Army, \$956,140,000.

Public Law 90-500, for research and development:

SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1969 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows: For the Army, \$1,611,900,000.

Public Law 90-408, for military construction:

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

UNITED STATES ARMY AIR DEFENSE COMMAND

CONUS, various locations: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and real estate, \$227,460,000.

The defense and military construction appropriation acts contain even broader language.

Clearly both the Safeguard and Sentinel systems fit under the language of the law.

In fact, there is an understanding in the Congress and in the Defense Department that funds must be spent for the purposes for which they were authorized and appropriated.

In the case of the ABM system, the purpose for which they were authorized and appropriated was to provide a defense against ballistic missiles. To accuse the officials of this administration of bad faith for deploying the best balanced ABM they can design is simply to disregard the previous actions of Congress.

Congress should not get into the business of trying to design the anti-ballistic-missile system either in its minute technical details or in its tactical deployment configuration. These decisions should be left to defense planners. I suspect that much of the agreement we hear, including many of the technical arguments, are being put forth by people who are already over their head or who are not apprised of all the facts.

Congress has in the past given rather broad authority for the construction of the ABM system. If it wishes to change this method of operation, it can do so when the additional funds which will be required for the deployment of phase I of the Safeguard system are authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 1970.

There are other items of more than average importance which are likely to escape specific attention because they are not sensational and because there appears to be no pressing need that they receive other than casual consideration. Yet these may be of very great importance.

For instance, there is the problem of maintenance of real property facilities. The taxpayers should be very directly concerned with this problem. So should be the military officials. So it would seem would be the Congress.

Nevertheless, this subject presents an increasingly aggravated picture which I want to discuss at this point.

The Committee on Appropriations has for many years been urging that the military services properly and adequately maintain the extensive real property holdings within their jurisdictions. Some 15 years ago this interest was manifested in the appropriation of funds above the budget estimates for the then existing backlog of deferred maintenance. The committee found that much of this claimed deferred maintenance either did not rest on valid estimates or the need was subsequently ignored by the services and the practice of appropriating over the budget for real property maintenance ceased.

Indeed, during the ensuing several years it became apparent that moneys justified to Congress for the maintenance of real property facilities were being diverted to other uses in the absence of any restrictive law or legislative history. Consequently in recent years, the committee has recommended, and Congress has agreed to, language in the appropriation acts establishing floors or minimums in the amounts of money which must be devoted to real property

maintenance. In the current Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1969, for example, the language reads for the Navy: "of which not less than \$155,600,000 shall be available only for maintenance of real property facilities."

In the case of the Marine Corps the language reads similarly: "of which not less than \$22,661,000 shall be available only for the maintenance of real property facilities."

House Document No. 91-50 proposed revisions reducing those amounts. Testimony in the hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill indicated that reductions were made in the floors on real property maintenance based on "congressional intent." It appeared from the testimony that this interpretation of congressional intent was based on the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 and its effect on Government expenditures generally.

It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have here a situation of either ignoring, or violating, congressional intent by the military.

I should like to point out that the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 was enacted into law on June 28, 1968, Public Law 90-364. While its terms and conditions allowed some flexibility, some considerable flexibility in the executive branch, there was not in connection with its enactment—at least to my knowledge—any discussion of an intent to cutback on the maintenance of real property facilities of the Department of Defense. Congress does not want these cutbacks.

Now I should like to point out that the appropriation bill for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1969 was enacted into law by virtue of the signature of the President on October 17, 1968, Public Law 90-580. The appropriation bill contains as a matter of law the phrases which I have previously quoted. I do not believe it likely that the Department can find a shred of evidence in the debate or in the committee reports on the defense appropriation bill indicating that the language of the law was intended to be set aside by any assumed or presumed interpretation of congressional intent stemming from the earlier enactment of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. On the contrary, it could be presumed that the enactment of the floors on maintenance of real properties in specific numbers and at a later date indicates the precise opposite, namely, that it is the intent that such an amount must in fact be expended for the purpose.

It is clear that much of the difficulty that we encounter in Congress, in the academic world, and through all facets of our society, stem from misinterpretations of honestly presented sets of facts. It is further clear that in most instances, if not in all instances, those who so misinterpret do totally and completely escape any remonstrance, much less punishment, for their willful acts.

Although I do not wish to magnify the incident out of all proportion, it is safe to say that the taxpayers of the country will at some future date have to shoulder the burden of new construction

prematurely or unnecessarily because of failure to adequately maintain facilities that are now in being. Certainly, someone should be called to task for permitting such a situation to exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Florida made reference to the anti-ballistic-missile program. The gentleman is aware that in the fiscal year 1970 budget which is before Congress, but which is not under consideration in this bill, there is about \$860 million for a continuation of the ABM program.

In my opening remarks, I took the position that we should go forward with the ABM program. I would like to amplify that by giving, in part, some of the reasons why we have been working on this program for years. The Soviet Union, our most formidable opponent, has a somewhat limited anti-ballistic-missile system deployed. It seems to me that it would be militarily and politically unsound and indefensible for use not to undertake to have a defense against the intercontinental ballistic missiles of the Soviet Union and of Red China.

My opinion is that we must proceed now with the anti-ballistic-missile program. It is my feeling that the Members of Congress, generally, will approve of this view, and I am convinced that the American people will approve of this view. I do not believe the American people want to be completely defenseless with respect to the intercontinental ballistic missiles of the Soviet Union or of Red China. This would be illogical while the Soviet Union is providing some defense for its people. Whether or not their system is very far advanced begs the question. Therefore we should undertake to provide some defense against the possibility of attack by intercontinental ballistic missiles of either nation.

I believe the gentleman's opening remarks should be read by all Members of the Congress.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman from Texas has stated the situation precisely and he has stated it very well.

We are trying to assure at this point that we can retaliate if the need should develop—we are seeking to insure for our country a capability which at least parallels the development which has been proceeding on an ABM system within Russia for a number of years. I feel that the American people demand that this be done. I feel that their voice is not really being heard in the quarters where protests are raised against the ABM system.

It is my opinion that we would be making a most serious mistake if we should not proceed with at least the

small ABM program that has now been proposed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would ask the gentleman further if an article in the U.S. News & World Report, by Dr. Teller, one of the great scientists of the country, and a discussion by Dr. Weisner, another great scientist, who are both very familiar with this problem, has been called to his attention.

We are aware that there is much discussion of the ABM in the scientific community, but as I see it this issue is one of judgment, and that is not an issue to be settled by the scientists alone. I would hope that those interested in this matter will probe deeply enough to understand what the fundamental issue is, and that is whether or not we shall let our chief opponent have a protection against our missiles and have none ourselves against his.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has stated the situation perfectly.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I concur completely with the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas in the need for the Safeguard ABM. I believe that it is absolutely necessary that we go ahead on this modified program as recommended by President Nixon.

The decision of President Nixon announced on March 14, 1969, calling for the deployment of the Safeguard antiballistic-missile system was made only after a searching and exhaustive analysis of the clearly emerging threat to the Nation and its people in the mid-1970's. All the available options and alternatives were thoroughly examined leading to the determination that Safeguard would provide a beginning toward the best protection against those threats.

In the judgment of the President, and of others within the Government who are charged with the direct responsibility for preserving our national security, the initial deployment of Safeguard represents the minimum action which must be taken now to preserve the credibility of our nuclear deterrent in the immediate years ahead.

The decision to deploy Safeguard is remarkable for the controversy which it has generated. Some members of the Congress and some persons within the scientific community have taken issue with the President's decision. They have been joined in their opposition by others who find in Safeguard an excellent opportunity to give vent to their frustrations over the course of events in Vietnam, thereby injecting an emotionalism into a debate which, because of its critical importance to national security, should be governed only by rational and reasoned factual presentations.

Because the President is Commander in Chief of our military forces and, more than any other one man charged with the awesome responsibility of providing for the national defense, many Members of Congress, in the exercise of their constitutional responsibilities, have normal-

ly followed the practice of according great weight to such momentous determinations by the President. The President has immediately at hand the most sensitive intelligence information upon which these vital decisions must be based.

For my own part, I would have to be absolutely convinced that I was right and the President was wrong before I could, in good conscience, oppose him on a national security matter of this magnitude. Moreover, in cases where the issue might be described as somewhat doubtful, my conscience would dictate that such doubts be resolved in favor of the President's determination that his recommended action is necessary for our country's protection. This has been my position with respect to all Presidents, of either political party.

It is obvious that all the people of the United States have a vital stake in the decision we make as to whether or not we should attempt a ballistic missile defense. It is appropriate to determine the desires of the people. And I mean all the people—not just those with the resources to publish and circulate their views, nor just those who participate in organized letter-writing campaigns to Congress.

When President Nixon assumed office in January of this year, he inherited from his predecessor the beginnings of deployment of an ABM system, the Sentinel. The decision of President Johnson, announced in September 1967, to begin deployment had been endorsed by Congress in 1968 and funds had been provided for a start on the system. Production of the various components of the system had been initiated, sites acquired, and, at some sites, work had commenced.

The Nixon administration suspended work on Sentinel deployment while it conducted a broad and thorough review of the general problems of ballistic missile defense including specifically the basic possible missions of such defenses and an analysis of the actual and potential Soviet and Chinese nuclear threat capabilities to our cities and to our strategic retaliatory capability.

An important part of the review included an analysis of the many alternative ways of accomplishing the ballistic missile defense missions. The alternatives examined included:

First, not building any ballistic missile defense at this time, maintaining the research and development program, and relying on improvements in our retaliatory weapons to deter Soviet and Chinese attacks on our cities and strategic retaliatory forces;

Second, defending our strategic retaliatory forces—our second-strike capability—by hardening our missile silos and further dispersing of our bomber bases; and

Third, several alternative ABM deployments, including: a "heavy" defense against Soviet nuclear attacks on our major cities, ballistic missile defense of our strategic retaliatory forces, the Sentinel defense against the expected Chinese threat and accidental attacks, a sea-based anti-ballistic-missile inter-

cept system—SABMIS—and various combinations of these alternatives.

Finally, the review included a careful evaluation of the technical and operational feasibility of ballistic missile defense systems based on current technology and current intelligence.

After a careful consideration of the alternatives, President Nixon reached the following conclusions: First, the concept on which the Sentinel program of the previous administration was based should be substantially modified; second, the safety of our country requires that we should proceed now with the development and construction of the new system in a carefully phased program; third, this program will be reviewed annually from the point of view of technical developments, the threat, and the diplomatic context including any talks on arms limitation.

The Safeguard system has been designed so that its defensive intent is unmistakable. It will be implemented not according to some fixed, theoretical schedule, but in a manner clearly related to a periodic analysis of the threat.

The Safeguard system provides for the phased protection of our land-based forces and the light, overall protection of population. This deployment will permit a shift of radar and missile sites away from major cities.

Both the Nixon administration and the Johnson administration agree on the capabilities and limitations of the ABM system which technology permits us to deploy at the present time.

Both administrations agree that our ABM system at its present stage of development cannot be expected, no matter how deployed, to provide an effective defense of all our Nation's population against a heavy nuclear attack.

Both administrations agree that our ABM system does have the capability, in several types of deployment, of defending all our population against a light nuclear attack.

Both administrations agree that our ABM system does have the capability of providing a strong, although not preclusive, defense of a specific target of limited area against a heavy nuclear attack.

This evaluation, concurred in by both administrations, is extremely important. It was not made lightly, nor by any one person, or by any persons specializing in one field. This is not just a weapon, but a weapon system. It consists of a number of components, including nuclear warheads, which were and continue to be designed and tested underground by our nuclear physicists; missiles, which have been designed, constructed, tested, repeatedly improved, and tested further; data processing equipment, which has also been built and tested; missile site radar, which has been built and tested; and perimeter acquisition radar, all the components of which have been tested. In addition, the system utilizes technology dealing with such diverse areas as component hardening and command and control.

An evaluation of the ABM system is a complex matter, requiring the participation of many specialists from various and sundry science and engineering

fields, who base their evaluations on the results of the tests performed. This, however, is the very type of careful evaluation which enabled the Johnson administration and, thereafter, the Nixon administration to conclude that our ABM system would work, and would do the job proposed for it.

Obviously, no one scientist, however learned, can credibly assume personally to evaluate the entirety of the system, particularly if he has not been privy to the testing accomplished with the components of the system. An impressive number of scientists, however, believe that it either will work or can be made to work.

The Johnson administration, based on an evaluation of the limitations and capabilities of the ABM system, devised a proposed deployment to provide a defense of our cities against the potential Chinese Communist capability to launch a light nuclear attack in the mid-1970's. This is what the Sentinel system, as designed by the Johnson administration, would have done; and this Safeguard will continue to do.

The preceding administration was also very much aware of the possibility that the Soviet Union might seek to develop a capacity to overwhelm our land-based missiles and bombers. It continued to watch the missile buildup in the Soviet Union, believing, however, as Secretary McNamara said in January 1968 that the growth of the Soviet ICBM force would decelerate instead of continuing at a high rate.

The Sentinel system of the Johnson administration has three purposes, according to Secretary Clifford:

First, to "prevent a successful missile attack from China through the late 1970's."

Second, to "limit damage from an accidental launch from any source."

Third, to "provide the option for increased defense of our Minuteman force, if necessary in the future."

Safeguard will provide for the first two purposes as enumerated by Secretary Clifford, but most importantly, it also will provide for the defense of our Minuteman force which under Sentinel, had been only optional.

Neither Secretary McNamara nor Secretary Clifford believed that the relative invulnerability of the missile forces of the United States was assured for the indefinite future. Both warned that additional steps might be required if that invulnerability was to be maintained in the 1970's. Just before leaving office, Secretary Clifford expressed his "increasing concern" about "the continuing rapid expansion of Soviet strategic offensive forces." He went on to warn that—

We must continually re-examine the various ways in which the Soviets might seek to strengthen their strategic forces beyond what now seems probable, and take appropriate actions now to hedge against them.

The decision on whether or not to deploy the Safeguard system turns, it seems to me, on the answer to two questions:

First. What is the nature of the threat which there is reason to believe will confront our Nation in the mid-1970's?

Second. Is Safeguard an effective way of coping with that threat?

When I speak of a threat to our security, I am not engaging in speculation about the intentions of any foreign power. As we should have learned from the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, it is dangerous to base our policy on assumptions relating to intentions. Anyone who is not privy to deliberations in the Kremlin can hardly speak with assurance about Soviet intentions at the present time. Even certain knowledge of present intentions would be a poor basis for judging the intentions of those who may be in power in the Soviet Union 5 years or more from now.

We would be derelict in our responsibility to the people if we failed to base our policies on an estimate of the capability that the Soviet Union or Communist China will have in the future if they continue on their present course and if we failed to take timely action to thwart that capability.

Projecting into the future the current rate of construction and deployment of the SS-9, we arrive at a figure of 600 such ICBM's in operation in the Soviet Union by 1976. If each SS-9 is equipped with three independently aimed warheads—a capacity which is technically feasible and on which the Soviet Union is working—our force of 1,000 long-range Minutemen would be in danger of annihilation from the 1,800 Soviet warheads. Let me quote Dr. John S. Foster, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, on this point:

A missile system having a 20 percent failure rate and carrying 3 re-entry vehicles per missile, would require only 420 missiles to attack 1,000 silos. If the yield of each re-entry vehicle was a reasonable 5 megatons and the accuracy a reasonable $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile, about 95% of the silos could be destroyed. This would mean 50 of the 1,000 Minutemen survive.

Our present strategic offensive force includes, of course, not only land-based long-range missiles but missile-carrying manned bombers and Polaris submarines. Can we not be complacent about the future, some may ask, since two of the three elements of our deterrent force would still be in existence after an SS-9 attack on Minuteman sites thereby enabling us to inflict retaliatory devastation on an attacking nation?

There are two answers to this question. First, if prudence had not required that we keep three elements in our deterrent force, we would not have developed and maintained three in the past. Our security is assured with three. The loss of one would leave us considerably less secure. We might get by with two, but that involves risks that we have been unwilling to take in the past. Further, we should remember that our bombers, even today, are to some degree vulnerable and that our submarines may become vulnerable in the future. We must now plan for our defense through the next decade. We know that the Soviet Union is at work on a fractional orbital bombardment system and other weapons which could make both bombers and submarines vulnerable to attack in the future. To assume that both will continue to be safe from attack would be sheer folly.

I do not want to overstate the case.

In order to achieve, in fact, the capability of eroding our assured destruction capability in the future, it will be necessary for the Soviets to do a number of things, but all are things which they have demonstrated a competence to accomplish. They would have to equip their SS-9 missiles with multiple, individually target reentry vehicles and improve their accuracy. They would have to continue to increase the number of such ICBM's deployed. They would have to continue their ambitious submarine program and possibly add a submerged launch missile utilizing a depressed trajectory. They could improve and deploy a more effective ABM system around their cities. The accomplishment of these improvements in forces, or combinations of these programs, on all of which they are now engaged, could create doubts of the effectiveness of our assured destruction capability, provided we take no steps not already programed to prevent, or to prepare to prevent, such an erosion.

Because the Chinese ICBM development program has not progressed as rapidly as estimated a year or two ago, there has been a tendency to overlook this potential threat in the present debate on the ABM issue. Today, the intelligence community is indicating that the Chinese Communists may have an operational ICBM within 3 to 4 years. If that happens, it will be incumbent on the United States to have an adequate protective force.

There are a number of factors which point out the need for Safeguard to counter this growing Chinese threat. Most of them have to do with demographic factors. The United States has 63 percent of its population living in the 1,000 largest cities. The Chinese, on the other hand, have only 11 percent of their population living in China's 1,000 largest cities. One can conclude that the Chinese population is widely dispersed throughout her large land mass. Furthermore, as Mao Tse-tung has pointed out on numerous occasions, China, with its population of 800 million, could survive even with a loss of 200 million people from a nuclear attack. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that our ability to deter Communist China with our strategic offensive forces is considerably less certain than in the case of the Soviet Union, whose population is much more concentrated than China's.

The population concentration factor has a vital bearing on our decision to proceed with the Safeguard program. The Chinese, with only a few, relatively crude ICBM's could inflict a great deal of damage on the United States. For the United States to retaliate against such a strike might require a greater portion of our deterrent force than we could safely commit. For, by responding to a Chinese provocation, we could leave ourselves naked to a Soviet attack.

These reasons, I believe, point out that Safeguard is a good investment for protecting against a possible Chinese attack as well as insuring the credibility of our deterrent against any possible Soviet attack.

The second question which we must ask to reach the decision about deploying Safeguard has to do with its effec-

tiveness. Of all possible courses of action which we might take to guard against the potential threat of the mid-1970's, Safeguard is the most effective, the least costly, the least provocative.

There is strong support among the most respected scientists who are familiar with all aspects of our ABM program for the conclusion that Safeguard will provide effective protection to enough of our offensive force to make an attack upon that force unprofitable for any aggressor.

Among the eminent scientists who have publicly expressed support for deployment of Safeguard are: Dr. Edward Teller, Livermore Radiation Laboratory, recognized as one of the world's foremost nuclear physicists; Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, Princeton University nuclear physicist, elected to the National Academy of Sciences 1945, Atoms for Peace Award 1960, Nobel Prize for Physics, 1963; Dr. William G. McMillan, University of California at Los Angeles, professor of chemistry, noted specialist on strategic nuclear matters such as reentry vehicle vulnerability, penetration aids, nuclear weapons effects, and missile vulnerability.

If we could delay our decision on Safeguard until we determine whether or not the Soviet Union continues to increase its capability to threaten our security—or whether success comes of negotiations to limit arms, I would be in favor of deferring the decision. Unfortunately, we cannot wait. It will require more than 4 years to complete phase I of the Safeguard system, the deployment of protection for two missile sites in Montana and North Dakota. In the absence of authorization from Congress for fiscal year 1970, the Defense Department would be required to stop the activity in which it has been engaged under authority granted last year. It would have to close down developmental production lines, discharge skilled personnel, and cease engineering on sites. If Congress then gave authority to proceed in the next year, the program would be delayed 2 years, and the first two sites would not be in operation until 1976. Time would be lost in the search for personnel with the necessary skills and in the training of a new force to begin the work anew.

If we are not ready at the time a threat to our security comes into being, we will be no better off than we would have been if we had done nothing at all. As Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird has said:

Too little and too late has been the epitaph of more than one great nation in history. It must not be ours.

If, in fact, the decision to deploy Safeguard imposed an obstacle to fruitful negotiations toward arms limitation, this might well give us pause. But let us remember that Premier Kosygin in 1967, speaking of the embryonic ABM system which the U.S.S.R. had already begun to deploy, said:

I believe that defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people.

Let us remember, too, that President Johnson's decision to deploy the Senti-

nel system, instead of hampering negotiations, was followed 4 days later by a statement of the Soviet leaders that they were interested in beginning talks on arms restrictions.

Safeguard is an inducement to arms limitation and a building block toward peace. We will go forward with talks on arms control with a better chance that these talks will result in effective agreements if it is clear to all the world that the United States does not intend to stand idly by while its capacity to defend its people is undermined. Indeed, an important inducement toward agreement is missing if the U.S.S.R. is led to believe that we will unilaterally limit our defensive capacity.

Safeguard is purely defensive. It is not an escalation of the arms race. It does not increase one whit the capacity of our country to inflict damage on any other nation. It is far more moderate step than the alternative some of its opponents propose—an increase in the size of our offensive missile force, or the reckless launching of our missiles upon a warning, that may or may not be valid, that we are about to be attacked. Increasing our offensive forces would step up the arms race and might give Soviet leaders some plausible ground for fearing that we were seeking a first-strike capability.

If the threat that may confront us in the mid-1970's fails to develop, whether because of international agreement on arms control or a change in the pace or character of the Soviet buildup, or for any other reason, Safeguard can be slowed down, altered, or abandoned altogether. Deployment is divided into phases so that our defensive precautions will match the threat and not become an overreaction to it.

President Nixon clearly made these points in his announcement of his decision on Safeguard on March 14 of this year. He said:

I have directed the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board—a non-partisan group of distinguished private citizens—to make a yearly assessment of the threat which will supplement our regular intelligence assessment. Each phase of the deployment will be reviewed to insure that we are doing as much as necessary but no more than that required by the threat existing at that time.

Since our deployment is to be closely related to the threat, it is subject to modification as the threat changes, either through negotiations or through unilateral actions by the Soviet Union or Communist China.

To keep in perspective the decision which the Congress will be called on to make this year, it is important to keep in mind the phased program of deployment that is proposed. This year, we decide only whether to begin on phase I so that by 1974 we may have in being an antimissile defense of two of our missile sites. We do not commit ourselves to go beyond that, and the Congress will have ample opportunity to check on the progress of deployment and to reassess periodically the continued need for the system.

If in fact Safeguard deprived us of resources needed to deal with our pressing domestic problems, that fact might give us pause. But Safeguard is not short-changing any program designed to cure

domestic ills. The decision to deploy this system involves spending in fiscal year 1970 only \$250 million more than would be spent if we limited ourselves to continuing with research and development. But a decision to defer deployment would add \$250 million to the total cost now estimated for deployment. The expenditure proposed for deployment in the next fiscal year amounts to three-tenths of 1 percent of the outlays proposed for defense. It amounts to a little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of proposed total Federal outlays. In its initial costs, it will be substantially less expensive than Sentinel would have been.

The estimated expenditure for the total Safeguard program is in the neighborhood of \$8 billion, including the warheads. This expenditure would, of course, be made over the course of many years. It is unlikely that in any year Safeguard will demand spending that would equal even one-half of 1 percent of the budget.

To my mind, the basic issue which the Safeguard proposal presents is the degree of risk to which we are willing to expose the American people. I am not inclined to gamble when the stakes are the survival of our Nation and the safety of its people. I would rather be wrong by providing a measure of defense that the future might show we did not need than be wrong by failing to provide the protection required.

I hope that all Members of Congress, when they vote on Safeguard, are conscious that they may well be voting on the survival of the United States.

(Mr. LIPSCOMB asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I am happy to yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there is the feeling on the part of many—and that includes myself—that if we move forward with our own ABM system, and we can move forward only at a certain rate of speed, that if we move forward with this program the likelihood will be enhanced that we can sit down at the conference table with the Soviet Union and arrive at some arms control agreement, not on disarmament, which I believe is unobtainable, but some agreement for a limitation on armaments. But so long as the Soviet Union goes forward with the deployment of its ABM and we take no steps at all, we are placed in a position in this particular field of defense—and this is defense, and not offense—of dealing from a position of weakness.

Mr. SIKES. It was after it was announced that we in this country were going ahead with the ABM system that the Soviets first agreed to hold a discussion on disarmament. This in itself is indicative of the validity of the statement the gentleman has just made: if we have a basis of strength from which to negotiate the Russians are much more interested in negotiating. There is no reason for them to negotiate if they have the field for themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Florida 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SIKES. I thank the gentleman for yielding the additional time.

CANCELLATION OF WEAPONS SYSTEMS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the committee was advised yesterday of the cancellation of the procurement of the Cheyenne helicopter. It was canceled because it had not been possible for the contractor to solve the problems involved in developing this system. Of course, this program is subject to investigation by various appropriate committees. The Appropriation Committee intends to take a look at it.

The military from time to time, in their sincere desire to provide superior weapons programs attempt to stretch the state of the art. They undertake to do things which are highly desirable by way of weapons development, but some of these things are not within the state of the art and cannot be accomplished.

Many years ago, we spent \$1 billion on a nuclear-powered aircraft, and finally we agreed that the state of the art had not progressed to where it was feasible to produce an acceptable plane of this type.

It is unfair and improper to condemn those who try to stretch the state of the art in order to improve our weapons. They make great efforts to add to the Nation's protection and to the budgeting capability of our servicemen.

Is it not understandable that in a stretching of the state of the art it is from time to time necessary to admit defeat? We are prone to call that "money down the drain," but if it is in the interest of trying to provide better defense it is not in the truest sense always money down the drain.

Mr. SIKES. This is of course the only way we can perfect our weapons systems. There must be trial and error. It is through this procedure that we have been able to develop the highly effective systems that we have. Fortunately most of them have not encountered problems as serious as the Cheyenne did.

In the case of the Cheyenne, unfortunately, hopes did not work out. Defense officials were seeking to develop a more effective weapons capability in a fast helicopter. The helicopter is largely a defenseless aircraft and yet it has been tremendously useful and has filled an extremely important need in Vietnam.

But it is highly vulnerable and the military were simply trying to provide a faster helicopter with an improved weapons capability that would enable it to stand off enemy attack and to provide greater support for the troops on the ground.

The thought was good. It would have been an extremely important development had it worked out—and eventually it probably will work out.

But in the effort to develop within a short time something that would be useful in the Vietnamese war, considerable moneys were expended. It has not been possible to develop the capability that is needed and rather than to continue to spend money on top of this already

costly program, the military has decided to cancel the Cheyenne.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that the object of producing the Cheyenne was an effort to make our military men more effective and to save the lives of American soldiers in Vietnam?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, the purpose is to save lives—that is the primary purpose. It would have reduced the vulnerability of the helicopter, which is a very important vehicle, and made it into a gun ship.

Mr. MAHON. Pursuing the matter further, reference was made today to the so-called TFX and the Navy version, the F-111B.

Here was an effort to produce an airplane which would be suitable for all of the services. The objective was highly desirable. A great effort was made to achieve it, but as we look back with 20/20 hindsight, and I am sure the gentleman from Florida would agree, it was a mistake to undertake to make the F-111 conform to the Navy's requirements, which are in some ways quite different from the Air Force requirements.

Mr. SIKES. Yes, but we did not realize that at the time. The defense officials again felt that this was a way to save money. They made a very determined effort. The effort failed and we have to share in the blame because we financed what we thought would be a workable concept.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think all of us are indebted to the chairman of the committee and to the second ranking member of the defense subcommittee and the ranking minority member of the committee for this colloquy which is putting some of these things in the proper perspective, particularly with respect to the ABM system. I think this colloquy has made it clear that we do not, as a practical matter, have a choice between the development of the ABM system on the one hand and some agreement or other limiting arms on the other. Quite to the contrary, if we were to unilaterally make the decision and announce to the world, as some of our colleagues would have us do, that we are not going to defend ourselves against the ICBM, we would thereby destroy our capability of reaching any meaningful agreement with reference to either the ICBM or the ABM.

Certainly, if we announce beforehand that we are not in a position to defend ourselves, and that we do not intend to be in a position to defend ourselves, then we would be going to the conference table with no cards at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I take this additional time, first, to thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin for this contribution which is sound, logical and meaningful.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. It seems to make news to be against a major defense program, at this time the ABM, but it does not make news to be in favor of providing this barrier against an attack which might come from China or from the Soviet Union.

There has been so much talk in the country and so many news columns written in opposition to our building a defense system designed to help to protect the lives of American citizens and to avoid World War III, it occurs to me that it is well for the world to know that there are many—and in my opinion the overwhelming majority of people in this country who believe that this kind of protection, as imperfect as it may be, is something we must seek to attain.

I wish to thank the gentleman and my colleagues for making reference to these matters. No one can convince me that the people of the United States want to be second best when it comes to self-defense. I do not think that we want our country to be second best, and I predict it will not be second best. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SIKES. Let me add that the deployment of the ABM system, which is now proposed, does not mean that we will have an imperfect system. We will have a system which has the benefit of years of research and development, and as deployment progresses, it will be possible to build into it any improvements which the state of the art permits, to insure that we will have a fully workable and an effective system.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is not one of the principal objectives of those of us who support the ABM to bring about a situation which will enable the United States and the Soviet Union—and other countries, we hope—to make some reduction in arms expenditures? That, after all, is our objective. I would hope we can join together in this effort and eventually through these procedures bring to a lower figure the vast resources we have to provide for defense.

Mr. SIKES. That is our objective. It is what we are working toward, and I believe it is a meaningful step in that direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) is recognized.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate and regrettable that the supplemental appropriation bill before us lumps together funds which are necessary and essential for important domestic programs with a request, as set forth in title I, for some \$1.2 billion for additional support for military operations in Southeast Asia.

Once again we are faced with a choice of either approving the entire package recommended by the Appropriations Committee, and thereby allocating still more funds to the prosecution of the war in Vietnam, or having to vote against the entire supplemental appropriation bill. I regret that the Appropriations Committee has put us in this situation again. There is strong and conscientious opposition to continuing to fund the war, and Members should have an opportunity to vote separately on the \$1.2 billion for military operations in Southeast Asia.

When the bill is open for amendment under the 5-minute rule, I intend to offer an amendment to strike title I of this bill, in order to eliminate the \$1.2 billion earmarked for Southeast Asian military operations. This would permit us to have an opportunity to vote on this question. However, of course, we know under the parliamentary procedure followed, there would be no opportunity for a rollcall vote. If my amendment does not prevail, then I intend to offer a motion to recommend if I have the opportunity.

I believe that as long as these funds remain in this bill, it should be defeated. I have pointed out that one-third is allocated for the prosecution of the war in Vietnam. We have already allocated for this fiscal year some \$27 or \$28 billion for the war in Vietnam. Now we are confronted again with another supplemental request.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that has been undertaken in this bill is to provide additional funds for the equipping of the South Vietnamese military forces, so that a lesser effort will be required by the U.S. forces. I believe that this portion of the plan—of transferring to the Government of South Vietnam a greater responsibility for fighting the war and maintaining the peace when the war comes to an end—probably would meet with the approval of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, would spell out exactly how much of the funds in the bill is for equipping the forces for South Vietnam. But it is clear also from the testimony, as I read it, that the supplemental provides funds for approximately 17,400 more American servicemen than were planned originally in the fiscal year 1969.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in the Army procurement portion of the bill before us, of the \$640 million, there are \$393.7 million for U.S. forces and \$246.4 million for the South Vietnamese Armed Forces modernization and improvement program. So a quarter of a billion in this bill is for the improvement and modernization of the equipment of the South Vietnamese forces. It is this quarter billion that the gentleman from Texas had in mind in propounding the inquiry of the gentleman. There are additional sums related to this procurement, such as \$50 million for the transportation of equipment, and so forth.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the explanation of the chairman. Nevertheless, that does leave for U.S. Southeast Asian military operations approximately \$1 billion—a little less perhaps. And it raises a further question about our overall policy in Vietnam in relation to the forces of South Vietnam.

In any event, let me point out that according to the testimony, on page 361, of General Taylor, the supplemental also provides funds for 17,400 more troops, that is U.S. troops, than had been originally intended.

It also provides funds for a 50-percent increase in bombing by B-52's in South Vietnam. I should point out that in answering a question raised by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS), General Crow said that the effect of the B-52 bombings was to make certain areas of South Vietnam look like the surface of the moon. The gentleman from Alabama then observed that the United States has used more bombs in Vietnam than in World War II and asked:

I wonder how it is going to look when we get through over there. Will it be habitable? (Hearings, p. 296).

I think that is a good question: Will it be habitable? Will anything be left? Or will we continue to destroy the country in order to save it?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman knows, this bill does not provide funds to send additional American fighting men to South Vietnam. It provides for the payment of the men who were sent over there as a result of the Tet offensive which caused us to increase our forces. It is not the intent of this bill to increase our manpower in South Vietnam.

Mr. RYAN. I understand the gentleman's argument. The impact, nevertheless, is to provide funds for a higher level of troops there than had been budgeted for fiscal year 1969.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, on the point the gentleman is making and the point the chairman of the Appropriations Committee made, the planned strength for U.S. forces in Southeast Asia has not been reached as yet, but the reason we are implementing funds in this supplemental bill is because the Tet offensive did extensive damage over there and made it necessary for us to commit more troops and more ammunition and other equipment.

Then, the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* by Communist North Korea took place. It caused us to supplement our efforts in the Korean area.

It was aggressive action by North Vietnam and North Korea which made this supplemental which is before us necessary. We are just supplying additional funds for those two aggressive actions by the Communists. That is the purpose of this supplemental.

Mr. RYAN. I do not quite understand how funds for the Korean situation come under title I, which is entitled "Military Operations in Southeast Asia."

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If the gentleman will yield, I will explain it.

Mr. RYAN. I do not have sufficient time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes.

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. At the time of the *Pueblo* incident, the House of Representatives and the Senate, in the appropriation bills, had included funds for Korea with funds for Southeast Asia.

I might point out to the gentleman that there are South Korean troops who are helping the United States and the South Vietnamese effort in South Vietnam.

Mr. RYAN. This supplemental appropriation bill is before us because of an underestimation of the cost of the war in Southeast Asia. Each year for the past 5 years Congress has been asked to appropriate supplemental money for the war in Vietnam.

I have pointed out on each one of those occasions—in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, and now 1969—that the only means the House has to change the Vietnam policy is to exercise the power of the purse. This bill presents us with another opportunity to vote on the conduct of the war.

Since last May, when the Paris peace talks were started, over 12,000 American servicemen have been killed in this war. There is no end in sight. The only way that the Congress, if it feels that this war must be ended, as I do, can exercise any influence on the direction of our foreign policy in Southeast Asia, is to vote "No" to these funds.

Therefore, I will offer an amendment under the 5-minute rule to strike title I. I hope it will have wide support so that we will be able to separate out the money for Southeast Asia military operations from the very essential funds contained in this bill for domestic programs.

Almost one-third of this appropriation is for military operations in Southeast Asia. H.R. 11400 provides total appropriations of \$3,783,212,766. Of this, \$1,234,000,000 or about 31 percent is allocated for Southeast Asia. This is above and beyond an estimated \$27.6 billion which Congress has already appropriated for Vietnam for fiscal year 1969.

Although President Nixon said in his nationwide television address last Wednesday that he intends to seek a mutual withdrawal of American and North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam, testimony from officials of the Department of Defense suggests an increase in the size and scope of our military operation in Vietnam. The testimony of Gen. A. B. Taylor, director of the Army budget, reveals that approximately 17,400 more soldiers were deployed in Southeast Asia than were originally specified in the fiscal year 1969 budget. According to General Taylor, these troops were not sent as replacements but as additions to the existing force. General Taylor went on to say that additional troops would be deployed during the next fiscal year. Hearings on second

supplemental appropriations bill, 1969, page 361.

For 5 years supplemental appropriations bills have been used to escalate the war and to deepen our military commitment in Southeast Asia. Although the appropriations sought in this bill may not result in the dramatic escalation that has occurred in the past, they will nonetheless be used to increase still further the killing and destruction that continues in Vietnam.

Each year the costs of the war have been underestimated in the initial budget. This happened in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, and now again in 1969. But each year the Congress has chosen to abdicate its responsibility to pass judgment on the war and has, instead, channeled more money into the quagmire in Southeast Asia.

For 5 years now, the critics of the war in Vietnam have been urging that we pursue alternative policies in Southeast Asia. In 1964, I urged a specific strategy for the neutralization of Southeast Asia to avoid broadening the conflict. But the conflict was broadened. In 1965, I argued against the Americanization of the war and against escalating our military commitment. But the war was Americanized and our commitment escalated. In 1966, I tried again to point to the policy alternatives available to us. But the choice of continued escalation was made. In 1967, I called again for renewed diplomatic efforts and an end to the bombing in the north. But diplomacy was secondary to the continued attempt to impose a military solution.

As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, the request for supplemental funds for Southeast Asian military operations has been tied in to other appropriations for some vital domestic programs which I support and, in some cases, have even proposed.

On January 30, I introduced an omnibus supplementary appropriation bill, H.R. 5562, to fully fund several important programs established under the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. Later, I reintroduced this legislation with 29 cosponsors—H.R. 7760, H.R. 7761. This legislation would provide supplementary appropriations to bring the section 235 homeownership program, the section 236 rental and cooperative housing program, the rent supplement program, the urban renewal program, and the urban renewal component of the model cities program to the full amount of funding authorized by Congress.

The bill before us today includes supplemental appropriations for three programs—section 235, section 236, and low-rent public housing program. Both section 235 and section 236 would receive an additional \$40 million for fiscal year 1969—which still leaves each program \$10 million less than the amount authorized by Congress. The low-rent public housing program—which remains the only effective way to reach low-income people in our larger cities—would receive an additional \$7,168,000 for fiscal year 1968 and \$16 million for fiscal year 1969 in contract authorization.

While I am pleased that the Appropriations Committee has recommended sup-

plementary appropriations to these three programs, I am disappointed that the bill does not provide additional funds for the rent supplement program, the urban renewal program, or the urban renewal sector of the model cities program. Each year the rent supplement program has been starved for funds; the current fiscal year is no exception. While the administration recommended \$65 million for rent supplements for fiscal year 1969, Congress appropriated only \$30 million. Similarly, urban renewal in model cities, although it was authorized to receive \$500 million, has appropriated only \$312 million.

These programs must be funded to the full amount authorized by Congress if we are to mount an effective attack on the crisis in urban housing which confronts this Nation. As has been the case so often before, the appropriations provided for Southeast Asian military operations in H.R. 11400 alone are greater than the amount which would be required to fully fund these vital housing programs.

I am also disturbed that a request from the Department of Housing and Urban Development for an additional \$2 million to carry out fair housing activities under title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 was denied by the committee. As Housing and Urban Development Secretary Romney stated in his testimony in support of this appropriation:

"It is simply impossible to attain this goal (providing a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family) without a major and continuing effort in pursuit of fair housing for every person in this country." (Parenthesis added) (Hearings on Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1969, p. 570.)

At present, the fair housing program has received only \$2 million to carry on that effort from Congress. If fair housing is to be guaranteed in this country, we must allocate more resources to pursuing that goal.

No doubt the argument will be made that, since the pending bill contains funds for several agencies which require supplemental allocations for their operations, as well as for programs, such as section 235 and section 236, it should be supported despite the title I appropriation for the war. I can not accept that argument, which ignores two basic factors.

First, if the House refused to approve this bill as long as it contained war appropriations funds earmarked for military operations in Vietnam would be removed; and the other parts of the bill would come back to the floor.

Second, and more basic, it must be recognized that vital domestic programs will not be funded adequately until the bloody and costly war in Vietnam is ended. So long as appropriations bills continue to allocate one-third of our available resources to Southeast Asian military operations—as this one does—our cities will continue to rot, and the social fabric of our Nation will continue to be ripped apart. We will never mount the concentrated attack on the multitude of domestic problems facing us—including housing, education, discrimination, and

pollution—so long as these programs receive only leftover scale allocations. The solution of our domestic crisis, in other words, must be preceded by an end to the war in Vietnam.

For 5 years the Congress has acquiesced in a disastrous policy. Some 35,000 American servicemen have been killed, and many more wounded and crippled. The country which we supposedly set out to save today lies in chaos and ruin. For 5 long years the resources of this country have been poured into an ill-conceived war, only to see our policymakers return the next year with requests for still more funds.

How long will this war go on? Another year? Another 2 years? Another 3 years?

If we are truly concerned with the continuation of this war—after it was thoroughly and roundly repudiated in the elections of last year; if we are concerned that after 1 year of negotiations in Paris we have not achieved peace; if we are truly desirous of terminating the death and destruction which continue to be wreaked on a small and unhappy nation—then let us now call a halt to this war through the only power the House possesses: the power of the purse.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to state to the Members of the House that it is the purpose of the committee to have read the first paragraph of the bill, which deals with "Military personnel, Army," lines 6 and 7 on page 2, and then I expect to move that the committee rise. Of course, amendments will be in order, but I expect to be recognized by the chairman to move that the committee rise, and then the amendment period would come tomorrow.

I should like to say further that it is proposed on tomorrow before we begin further consideration of the bill, that the Rules Committee will offer a rule which will make in order the expenditure limitation, which is carried in title IV of the bill.

So, if the rule is adopted—and, of course, we hope it will be adopted—we will proceed with the reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The language that you would have read this afternoon, do I understand, goes to line 7 on page 2?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. It would end at the figure \$110 million in line 7 on page 2.

Mr. GROSS. That includes no language, then, that is subject to a point of order?

Mr. MAHON. No.

Mr. GROSS. The rule is designed to waive points of order.

Mr. MAHON. The rule is designed to protect against points of order only in title IV, which relates to the expenditure limitation. It will not protect any other part of the bill than the expenditure limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11400

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Army", \$110,000,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill this afternoon may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain tables and excerpts relating to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR ATTEMPTING TO COVER UP FUENTES AFFAIR

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, Mr. Hilary Sandoval, Jr., the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee to discuss an SBA loan to a New York company with alleged underworld ties.

Shortly before the hearing, I received a telegram from the Honorable HENRY B. GONZALEZ, a distinguished member of the committee, concerning "an alleged shakedown" of a small business loan applicant by Mr. Albert Fuentes, special assistant to Mr. Sandoval.

The telegram follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 25, 1969.

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D.C.:

Affidavits in my possession and on file with the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that there is reason to believe that Albert Fuentes, special assistant to the Administrator, Small Business Administration, has engaged in or attempted to engage in shake-

downs of SBA loan recipients. I have requested the administrator to suspend Fuentes pending full investigation and request that you join in this action. I request that the committee under your able leadership investigate all loans either made or pending in Texas offices of SBA since Fuentes entered his position and that investigation be made particularly in the San Antonio area.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

When Mr. Sandoval appeared before the committee, I asked him to look into the Fuentes situation and to report his finding to the committee. Mr. Sandoval agreed to this request. The transcript of the hearing clearly spells out what information Mr. Sandoval was to provide. The transcript states:

The CHAIRMAN. Now I will ask you to take this telegram and give me a report on Mr. Fuentes. You can do that, I assume?

Mr. SANDOVAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And also to give me all the information about the loans in the San Antonio area.

Mr. SANDOVAL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And if any of them provoke your thinking along the lines as not being regular, call them to our attention.

Mr. SANDOVAL. Yes, sir.

Following Mr. Sandoval's appearance, I learned that SBA investigators had visited the San Antonio SBA office and looked into the Fuentes situation. After allowing a reasonable length of time for the investigators' report to be forwarded to Washington, I wrote to Mr. Sandoval on May 12. The letter asks Mr. Sandoval not only to provide the Fuentes report but also to furnish the committee with a document that is extremely important to the committee's investigation of the New York loan to the alleged criminal controlled company. The letter follows:

MAY 12, 1969.

Mr. HILARY SANDOVAL, JR.,
Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. SANDOVAL: It has come to my attention that a memo dated January 5, 1967, from Mr. William Bowling to then Small Business Administration Administrator Bernard Boutin, contains a great deal of background information concerning SBA's involvement with A.N.R. Leasing Corporation. This memo is of vital importance to the Committee's examination of the A.N.R. loans and because of this, it is imperative that the Committee be given a copy of the complete memo immediately.

It is my understanding that there may be a problem in releasing the memo in that it contains FBI and Justice Department information. In this regard, it would be appreciated if you would take action to secure the release of the memo from the Justice Department and immediately forward it to the Committee.

In addition, you will remember that during your appearance before the Committee on April 26th, I asked you to make a complete investigation of the charges made against Mr. Albert Fuentes. While I realize you have turned the matter over to the FBI, it is my understanding that SBA investigators have been looking into Mr. Fuentes' relationship with the San Antonio office. Because of the importance of this matter, it would be appreciated if you would immediately inform the Committee as to the results of your investigation of this incident and also if any other loans involving alleged improper action on the part of Mr. Fuentes

have been uncovered. Your earliest reply would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

It is quite clear from even a most casual reading of the letter that two different subjects are covered in the letter. The staff of the Banking and Currency Committee had been informed by SBA officials that the memo from Mr. Bowling to Mr. Boutin contained information from the FBI and Justice Department and that permission would have to be obtained from these departments to release the memo. Because of this, my letter specifically asked Sandoval to take action to secure release of the memo to the committee because of its important nature to our investigation.

The last paragraph of the letter deals solely with Mr. Sandoval's promise to supply the committee with the report on the Fuentes case.

It does not suggest that the Fuentes report, promised the committee by Mr. Sandoval, should be turned over to the Justice Department, nor does the letter make any reference to the Justice Department in connection with the Fuentes case.

After the letter was sent to Mr. Sandoval, a member of the Banking and Currency Committee staff called SBA to find out when the Fuentes report would be made available. He was assured that the report would be in the committee office the following morning, along with some other material that the committee had requested. The following morning, SBA did send information concerning its lending activities in cases under study by the committee, but did not send the Fuentes report. The SBA official who brought the material to the committee stated that he did not have a copy of the Fuentes report but that he would call back to his office and make certain that the report was placed on his desk and that he would personally hand deliver the report that afternoon. Later in the day, still another SBA official reported to the committee staff that the committee would not be able to get a copy of the report that afternoon because, "I do not know where a copy of the report is and even if I did, I do not have authority to release it."

He said that Mr. Sandoval was out of town and could not be reached. The following day, several members of the Banking and Currency Committee staff attempted to obtain copies of the report but were unsuccessful. The reason given at that time for the report not being made available was that Mr. Sandoval was out of town and the report could not be released without his approval. When the committee staff attempted to locate Mr. Sandoval they were told by his office that—

He is in New York but I don't know where to get in touch with him or exactly where he is.

The following day, Mr. James Reed, congressional relations director for SBA, called the committee staff to state that the Fuentes report had been turned over to the Justice Department and would not be made available to the committee.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 22, 1969
For actions of May 21, 1969
91st-1st No. 83

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,3,8a	Lobbying.....4	Retirement.....20
Consumer.....6,29	Marketing.....25	Rice inspection.....23
Cigarette labeling.....7	Nonfarm income.....2	Rural loans.....12
Contracts.....33	Packaging.....13	Shoes.....8
Education.....19,27	Personnel.....20	Small business.....2
Farm program.....3,24	Pesticides.....17	Subsidy payments.....3
Fees and charges.....30	Pollution.....22	Supplemental
Food additives.....21	Population.....19	appropriations.....1
Food inspection.....6	Poverty.....5	Taxation.....2,22
Foreign trade...8,14,25,32	Prices.....16	Timber.....15,18
Forestry.....11,18	Property.....31	Transportation.....26
Germ warfare.....17	Raisins and prunes.....25	Water and sewer.....12
Health benefits.....20	Recreation.....9,30	Water resources.....10
Loans.....28	Research.....19	Wilderness.....11

HIGHLIGHTS:

House passed second supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee voted to report several wilderness bills. Rep. Findley stated he will offer amendment to establish \$20,000 farm payment limitation. Rep. Schwengel favored legislation to curtail tax-dodge farming. Rep. Hamilton objected to proposed cut in rural water systems funds. Rep. Price, Tex., introduced and discussed bill to increase loan limitation on certain FHA loans.

HOUSE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 347-46, with amendments H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill (pp. H3903-32). Rejected, 49-165, an amendment by Rep. Hall to eliminate the House Members' pay raise for the balance of fiscal year 1970 (pp. H3924-5) and an amendment by Rep. Cohelan, to eliminate the limitation on fiscal year 1970 budget outlays from the bill (pp. H3927). A motion by Rep. Cederberg to recommit the bill was rejected (p. H3932).
2. TAXATION. Rep. Vanik opposed any extension of the surtax. p. H3902
Rep. Patman supported the repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit and some other means of investment help "provided for small business only." pp. H3942-3.
Rep. Schwengel stated "one measure that must be included in any overall reform program is the curtailment or...complete abolition of the tax gimmick whereby wealthy individuals and corporations are able to set up farm and ranch operations purely for tax reduction purposes." pp. H3990-1
Rep. Miller, Ohio, stated that tax reform hearings disclosed "abuses of the exemptions granted large educational and charitable foundations" and the "inequities of tax-sheltered trust funds, farm-loss deductions," etc. p. H3991
3. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Findley announced that when the USDA appropriation bill is brought up it is his intention to offer an amendment to establish a \$20,000 limit on individual farm payments. He inserted a listing of recipients whose payments under the farm programs in 1968 exceeded \$25,000. pp. H3943-80
4. LOBBYING. Received a listing of registrations and quarterly reports by persons engaged in lobbying activities. pp. H3998-4027
5. POVERTY. Rep. Perkins inserted a statement by the National Chairman, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, urging Congress "to intensify our commitment to end poverty in America." pp. H3986-7
6. FOOD INSPECTION; CONSUMER PROTECTION. Rep. Foley commended the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, for its support of meat and poultry inspection legislation and inserted the union's policy statement on consumer protection concerning food. pp. H3940-1
7. CIGARETTE LABELING. Rep. Fuqua opposed the Federal Trade Commission's "drastic regulation of cigarette labeling and advertising." p. H3902
8. SHOES. Rep. Wyman urged all Members to join in signing a letter appealing to the President for action now to help protect the American footwear industry from foreign imports. p. H3901, H3987-8
- 8a. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee was granted until midnight Thurs. May 22 to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill. p. H3902



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 115

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1969

No. 83

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, May 23, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, MAY 21, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Father Ward W. White, Vincen-
tian Fathers House of Studies, Washing-
ton, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O God, You who have taught us to call
You our Father, we need a father's care.
We are tired, Lord, grant us energy. We
are fearful, grant us courage. We are
nearsighted, grant us vision. We are in
turmoil, grant us peace. When we grow
callous, teach us compassion. When we
are tempted, teach us integrity. When
we grow haughty, teach us true perspec-
tive.

Grant the Cuban people, Lord, a full
share in Your courage, Your vision, Your
peace, and that freedom without which
human life is not fully human. This we
ask in the name of the Lord Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of
yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr.
Arrington, one of its clerks, announced
that the Senate had passed without
amendment bills of the House of the fol-
lowing titles:

H.R. 2948. An act for the relief of Maria
Prescilla Caramanzana;

H.R. 3464. An act for the relief of Maria
Balluardo Frasca; and

H.R. 8188. An act to provide for the strik-
ing of medals in commemoration of the 100th
anniversary of the founding of the city of
Wichita, Kans.

The message also announced that the
Senate had passed bills of the following
titles, in which the concurrence of the
House is requested:

S. 564. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene
G. Queja;

S. 620. An act for the relief of Richard
Vigil; and

S. 1888. An act to change the composition
of the Commission for Extension of the
U.S. Capitol.

THE CRISIS FOR THE AMERICAN FOOTWEAR INDUSTRY

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given
permission to address the House for 1
minute, to revise and extend his remarks
and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the present
threat to the American footwear industry
from foreign imports of shoes and
leather now out-of-hand, is beyond the
peril point. Unless action is taken now,
this year, this quarter, to check the im-
port flood there will be additional thou-
sands of American shoe workers out of a
job and additional closings of American
shoe factories. An indication of the grow-
ing, dismaying number of closings of
shoe plants appears in the Extensions of
Remarks in this RECORD.

The 1968 figures on foreign footwear
imports are truly shocking. In 1968 for-
eign imports rose from 87 million pairs
in 1967 to 175 million pairs—more than
100 percent. This is a substantial portion
of the entire American consumption.
U.S. footwear production is off nearly
10 percent for the first quarter of 1969
alone.

We who represent constituencies with
a substantial shoe and leather employ-
ment are asking Members to sign a letter
appealing to President Nixon to initiate
immediate negotiation with principal
foreign supplying nations directed to-
ward the establishment of voluntary im-
port limitations. Shortly our capable
chairman, the distinguished Member
from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) or my-
self, will present this letter to you for
signature. It is a worthy cause, a meri-
torious appeal, and its objective is a valid

and continuing concern to all Members
whether or not they have constituents
who are employed in the footwear in-
dustry.

I hope all Members will join in sign-
ing this urgent request of President
Nixon for action now to help protect this
important domestic industry.

SGT. DALE K. LARSON

(Mr. HANSEN of Idaho asked and was
given permission to address the House
for 1 minute, to revise and extend his
remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker,
on March 25, 1969, and again on April 3,
1969, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr.
FINDLEY) inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL
RECORD a list of the names of Americans
who have lost their lives in the war in
Vietnam.

The name of a fine young man from
Idaho was apparently inadvertently
omitted from that list. Sgt. Dale K. Lar-
son, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Verl K.
Larson of Burley, Idaho, was killed in
Vietnam on November 12, 1968, while
serving aboard a helicopter during a
combat mission. Prior to his death, Ser-
geant Larson had served with valor and
distinction in Vietnam, having volun-
teered for over 50 combat missions dur-
ing the 4 months he was in Vietnam.
Among the honors he received were the
Air Medal with seven Oak Leaf Clusters
and the Bronze Star.

I know my colleagues will want to join
me in acknowledging the debt of grati-
tude owed by this Nation to Sergeant
Larson for having paid the supreme sac-
rifice while in the service of his country
and in extending to his parents, Mr. and
Mrs. Verl K. Larson, and other members
of the family, our sincere sympathy at
their loss.

PELLY REISSUES CALL FOR COAST GUARD PROTECTION OF U.S. FISHERMEN OFF PERU

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the deterioration of relations between the United States and Peru, coming on the heels of the seizure of another American fishing vessel last Friday, increases my concern over the upcoming fishing season off the Peruvian coast during which time a good number of U.S. fishermen will be working for tuna.

It is because of this concern that today I have requested that the President take the action necessary in providing Coast Guard protection off the Latin American coast for American fishermen.

This is not an idle concern, Mr. Speaker, because it is my thinking that as much as Americans on the high seas should be protected from illegal harassment and seizure, the rights of the coastal nation's 12-mile limit also should be protected. My request for the presence of our Coast Guard beyond the 12-mile limit is also to assure that our fishermen do not violate any international law, conservation agreement, or treaty.

Meanwhile, I again call to the attention of my colleagues my legislation which would cut off the importation to this country of fish and fish products from any country seizing U.S. fishing boats beyond the 12-mile limit and urge support of this measure as a means of getting these differences on fishing issues between the United States and Peru to a conference table where such matters as our historic rights on the seas can be properly discussed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Thursday, May 22, to file a privileged report on the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1970.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Anderson, Ill.	Frey	Powell
Anderson, Tenn.	Gallagher	Rallsback
Baring	Gialmo	Randall
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Reifel
Bates	Hastings	Riegle
Bingham	Hathaway	Rodino
Blatnik	Hébert	Rumsfeld
Buchanan	Heckler, Mass.	Sandman
Cahill	Helstoski	Scheuer
Carey	Hogan	Shipley
Chappell	Howard	Sisk
Chisholm	Joelson	Skubitz
Clark	Kirwan	Smith, N.Y.
Clay	Lowenstein	Stokes
Collier	Lujan	Stratton
Conyers	McCloskey	Symington
Cowger	McMillan	Waggonner
Culver	Meskill	Whalen
Dawson	Mollohan	Wiggins
Dent	Morse	
Edwards, La.	Murphy, N.Y.	
Ford	Murphy, Ill.	
William D.	Ottlinger	
	Pollock	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

END THE SURTAX

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday before the Ways and Means Committee, Secretary of the Treasury David M. Kennedy and the Honorable Paul W. McCracken, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, testified that President Nixon's proposal to extend the surtax would result in a budgetary surplus of \$6.3 billion. They also testified that a December 31, 1969, termination of the 10-percent surtax would result in a \$4.1 billion surplus while a September 30, 1969, termination of the 10-percent surtax would provide the administration with a balanced budget.

I oppose any extension of the surtax. It is quite evident that moderate revenue-producing tax reforms and the repeal of the investment credit can provide the administration with sufficient revenues to permit a balance in the 1970 budget. Termination of the surtax will stimulate aggressive action for revenue-producing reform.

Signs of a growing taxpayer revolt are evidenced throughout the Nation in the defeat of vital school and local issues. Under these circumstances, we must make every effort to lighten the taxpayers' burdens.

The termination of the surtax will provide needed and immediate relief.

CRITICAL OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has undertaken drastic regulation of cigarette labeling and advertising without regard for the fact that this matter is under very serious

consideration by the House Commerce Committee.

I personally oppose their action.

It seems to me that this is a slap at the Congress and is not in keeping with the proper function of our two governmental bodies.

This is the same course that the Federal Communications Commission took earlier this year.

It seems to me that when a matter is under active and very serious consideration by the Congress, then an agency such as the Federal Trade Commission shows very poor judgment and lack of good taste in issuing orders which would promulgate actions which may or may not be enacted in such legislation.

But at the very least, the Federal Trade Commission should not have moved until the present Congress had had an opportunity to enact or reject legislation which is currently pending on this very subject.

It may be that the House Commerce Committee might recommend more stringent regulation or it may be that they will propose something entirely counter to the directive of the Federal Trade Commission.

The point is that Congress should have the time to act and that any Federal agency shows a lack of judgment and good taste when it usurps the lawmaking function of the Congress.

Regardless of the merits of the case, the Federal Trade Commission did not act properly in this instance. I think it is more reason than ever for the House Commerce Committee to get on with its deliberations and give the Members of the Congress an opportunity to express themselves on this subject.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflected that I was not present for the quorum call. This was an accurate reflection. I would like for the RECORD to state at this point the reason for my absence. I was in my home district in Missouri attending the funeral of an immediate member of the family.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 57, today, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I intend to cast my vote against the second supplemental appropriations bill for one reason—this will be the first and only opportunity Members of Congress have had to go on record against the recent exorbitant pay increases granted to Congressmen, the President, the Supreme Court, Federal judges, and other high Federal officials. I have consistently voiced opposition to these untimely and inflationary pay increases that were effected by a parliamentary subterfuge.

Let me state firmly that I realize the necessity of fully supporting our fighting men in Vietnam and I do endorse additional funds to provide the material and equipment needed for their operations. I also would support needed expenditures for other worthy Government programs that are funded in this bill.

I want to go on record as favoring the Government spending limitation to be imposed by this bill. I personally believe the ceiling should be set at a much lower level, but the concept of definite spending controls is highly desirable and long overdue. Congress should insure that the Government lives within its means. An expenditure ceiling is a step in this direction.

The pay raise issue outweighs the merits of the necessary and beneficial programs for which additional funds are required. A more responsible procedure would be a separate vote on the appropriations for the pay raises and I will support all efforts to remove the pay raise provisions from the bill for a separate vote. Should such efforts fail, I will have no choice but to vote against the entire package.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a correction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20. In my statement on the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore on page H3866, the town of Tremont, Ind., has been misspelled. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected to include the town's correct spelling.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR THE WAIVER OF POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST TITLE IV OF H.R. 11400

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 414 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 414

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, all points of order against title IV of said bill are hereby waived.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority, to the very able and distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH). Pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not use all the time on this resolution. This is a rather unusual situation that we find ourselves in, parliamentarily speaking. We have debated the supplemental appropriation bill at some length under the privileged status of the Appropriations Committee. Now we come in with a resolution from the Rules Committee for one purpose and one purpose alone; that is, to waive points of order against a particular section of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, really, the legislative issue that is made in order here is a rather important one in my opinion and one which under different circumstances I should like to address myself to at some length but which I shall not do now.

The language that the rule waives the point of order against is found in title IV of the bill. Title IV of the bill places a ceiling upon the amount of the expenditures that the Chief Executive can make within the fiscal year. Now, that amount is, roughly, \$192 billion.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am just a little surprised that the Chief Executive or the departments downtown have not raised some points of order themselves against this bill. But, I am very happy that they have not done so. I say that because here the burden of holding down expenditures is placed upon the President. In other words, he is placed in a straitjacket as it were. I do not think on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal of difference in the manner in which this bill is supposed to be handled than the one last year under a previous administration. In the final analysis I think there is a great similarity in that the Chief Executive at that time was somewhat placed in a straitjacket also. However, Mr. Speaker, what I want to emphasize in these few remarks as I have done so many, many times on the floor of this House is the importance, yes, the necessity of cutting down on expenditures by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal about a tax revolt, and it is not being confined to the Federal Government by any means. I noticed that down in my great State some elections have been held recently for municipal offices which resulted in a considerable upheaval and people were thrown out of office who had held those offices for a long period of time. In my judgment that was a part of this reaction to high taxes that exist all over the country.

We, of course, here in the Congress set the pattern a long time ago and the States, the counties, the municipalities and the boroughs are falling in line. You cannot blame the people when we realize the very high taxes that we are extracting from them at every level of Government. In my opinion this upheaval, this general unrest among the taxpayers is going to not only continue, but it is going to accelerate. So what we are talking about here is the effort to place a ceiling upon the amount of money that can be expended and thereby apply the brakes to this ruinous inflation which threatens our entire economy.

Mr. Speaker, we might as well realize that it will cause some hardships, that it will cause some pet projects to go down the drain, and that it will necessitate some real sacrifices. But if we do not live

up to this expenditure limitation—and in the final analysis the Congress is going to have to live up to it as well as the Executive—the control on unbridled spending can be wiped out, whatever good intentions there might be. It can be wiped out overnight through the simple method of supplemental appropriation bills such as the one we have here at this moment—so the Congress has its responsibilities as well as the Chief Executive.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone here on the floor is interested—and frankly, I am not sure that many are—I just want to emphasize a point which is of vital interest to the taxpayers. I was sitting here with a very able member on the staff of the Committee on Appropriations, a moment ago, and the discussion led to the amount of our national debt which as most of us know is now in the neighborhood of \$365 billion. But even more startling and more important is the fact that the second largest item of governmental appropriations is for the payment of interest on that debt.

Now, in answer to a question he pointed—and I do not know how many minutes I have been talking here, but let us say that I have been talking for 20 minutes—that the interest on the national debt is about \$31,000 per minute. Now, while I have been talking for 20 minutes, the interests on the national debt has increased \$620,000. Surely this should make all of us stop and consider whither we are headed.

Mr. Speaker, maybe we ought to stop, look, and listen. I just wanted to raise some warning signals again here this afternoon, for whatever they are worth, that some day down the line there is going to be a day of reckoning.

Mr. Speaker, who would have thought that we would have ever gotten to the point where we would be spending \$192 billion a year, 10 or 20 years ago? Yet now we are trying to limit that expenditure to these \$192,900 million.

Mr. Speaker, I have been over this so many times that I should not pursue it further.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am happy to yield to my friend, but before I do, may I say that the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS), along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the chairman of the committee, have both in my judgment done an excellent job of trying to apply the brakes here.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, and also for myself I would like to express appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules for his generous remarks. I agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that this spending limitation is going to create quite a burden for the executive branch of the Government.

It is already evident that the spending levels projected in the revised budget are too low. The gentleman from Mississippi mentioned the national debt and the interest on it. I think that before

the year is over, we will find that the interest on the national debt will be substantially higher than it was estimated to be in the budget. Other examples could be cited but it is sufficient I think to remark that this limitation is going to be hard to live with.

While the revised budget is about \$4 billion under the original budget which we received in January, it nevertheless is about \$8 billion higher than the spending levels of 1969. In this respect I do not see how it can be regarded as austere. And as I frequently voted for spending limitations last year, and I offered several limiting amendments myself, I feel that I should vote for this one this year. To do otherwise, would put me in an inconsistent position and a "no" vote by me this year would be regarded as a relaxation of my feeling that substantial spending reductions are necessary if we are to win the battle against inflation and return to a sound fiscal policy, importance of the limitation of spending just because there has been a change in the administration downtown. Just as I supported and voted for and offered some of the amendments last year, I am supporting this spending limitation this year.

I would point out to those who are worried for fear the Government will run out of money under this spending limitation that there always is the opportunity, as the gentleman from Mississippi has already explained, for the executive to come back to the Congress and submit a request and there will be opportunities all during the session for the Congress itself to impose some spending limitations on the individual appropriation bills as they come from our committee. We are going to have two on the floor next week.

So there is not any reason to be worried about the Government coming to an end because we impose this spending limitation.

This is an effort on our part to invoke some fiscal responsibility and to strike a blow for the economy which I think will be helpful to the Government and to the taxpayers of the country as well.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman certainly would agree with me, and this is one of the points I wanted to make and did make—that if this House—if this Congress wants really to have a confrontation with this situation that one of the best things it can do, if not the very best thing, is to stop authorizing new programs with built-in accelerations costs in them from year to year. I am sure the gentleman will agree.

Mr. JONAS. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. I would go one step further. I will say that the first place to call a halt is on the authorizing bills. The second place is on appropriation bills which the committee reports and recommends to the House, and the third place is right here—this Chamber when the Members vote on final passage.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for his statement on the general subject of fiscal responsibility.

I wonder if the gentleman knows of a single bill providing for spending that has been brought before the House of Representatives up to this day and hour that has not called for increased spending?

Mr. COLMER. I would have to answer the gentleman in the negative.

Mr. GROSS. So that while the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Iowa fervently hope that this \$192,900 million ceiling, if imposed, will work—we hope it will work—but we hope for the best and fear the worst—would that be representing the thoughts of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. COLMER. I will go along with my friend, as usual.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa will have to see better evidence than he has seen, however, in this session of Congress to convince him that this ceiling will have any meaning at all.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman. We can only hope and continue to try—otherwise we are lost.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to state that the proposed limitation is along the same line of that contained in the resolution we adopted at the last session of the Congress in which there was a cutback of \$4 billion? Is this similar to that?

Mr. COLMER. In effect, to my mind, yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is.

Mr. COLMER. In that we place a limitation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is there any language to guarantee that the veterans will be paid their pensions under this setup, as was provided in the resolution in the 90th Congress, to which I referred?

Mr. COLMER. My understanding, I may say to the gentleman from Colorado, is that there are no exemptions and no exceptions provided for in this bill. I know the gentleman is a very devoted friend of the veteran, as most of us are. I am rather happy that he used that illustration because, as I said, we are all for the veteran, and I put my record up against the gentleman's or anybody else's on that. But what I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado is that I believe firmly that the veterans of this country who bared their breasts to the enemy on foreign soil, who flew across the trackless oceans, and who are now dying in Vietnam are perfectly, and would be perfectly willing, if it came to that, to make some financial sacrifice as well as to offer their blood on the altar of their country. I am firmly of the opinion, that the man who is willing to defend his country on the battlefield is willing to make a little sacrifice, if it comes to that, on the homefront. Moreover, I believe that most, if not all, of our veterans would like to see the rest of us make a little sacrifice in order to save the country here on the homefront.

But permit me to say further, to the gentleman from Colorado, that I see no reason for concern here. It has been my

observation in my long years of service here, that this Congress is always zealous of the interest of those who have fought the battles of this country in times of war. If it develops that this procedure which we are adopting here today to save the Republic from the enemy of inflation and that our veterans may be hurt, I am confident that this Congress will see that our veterans are not hurt.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand, in this Congress we have not as yet approved any of the 12 or 14 appropriation bills, that is, the regular appropriation bills.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It is anticipated that when July 1 comes, probably we shall not have approved half of them by that time, if any. If this resolution is adopted, at the coming of July 1, when we have a resolution to continue the appropriations of last year, so to speak, how would this resolution be applied? Would it be applied in a reduction of a quarter of a billion dollars on last year? In what manner will it be applied if we have continuing appropriations?

Mr. COLMER. I think I can answer that question, but I would prefer to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to answer the question and I would prefer that my friend from Colorado, for whom I have a high regard, would direct his technical questions to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. With respect to operations on and after July 1, 1969, for the agencies for which appropriation bills are not enacted into law by that time, there would, of course, have to be a continuing resolution. But we would act prior to that time—certainly in the House we hope to—on the independent offices appropriation bill, which usually contains the funds for the Veterans' Administration.

When we bring to the House a continuing resolution next month, the continuing resolution will be written in such a way as to take care of the situations which may be before us.

The \$192.9 billion ceiling which is placed on expenditures for next year by title IV, I might say, is, in the aggregate, about \$8 billion above the estimated total expenditure figure for the current fiscal year 1969.

There is another significant thing about this ceiling. This ceiling does not provide for any reduction whatever from the President's projected spending total. Last year, Congress made a \$6 billion cutback, and that had to be cut out of the hide of the budget. Title IV provides that the beginning ceiling of \$192.9 billion will increase or decrease, dependent upon what Congress does on the various spending bills involved, as they are considered. If Congress increases the budget on which the beginning ceiling figure is based, then the ceiling will go up; if the

budget is reduced, then the ceiling is to be adjusted downward appropriately.

If there is a Member of this House who is not a friend of the veteran, or who has a spirit of ingratitude toward the veteran, I do not know who that Member is. I cannot see any thought or probability that any injustice will be done to the veterans. I, myself, will vote to provide any funds and will support any funds that are required or in any way reasonably justified before the Congress for such purposes. I think of all people who should have no concern about what Congress will do, the veterans are in the most secure position.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas states that if it becomes necessary to have an extension—as we will, no doubt, have in certain areas—after July 1, as we did last year when I think we went each month until November, if these things develop they will be taken care of at that time. Is it not possible we could put this kind of resolution for the continuation of appropriations over until that month?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, when we have the continuing resolution before us next month, we can call before us the director of the Veterans' Administration or hear anyone else we need to, but we will make sure that the resolution is drawn in such a way that all needs are met for the returning veterans. Of course, there are accelerating costs and requirements. Everybody is in favor of taking care of them. There is no problem about taking care of that kind of thing.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. But what is wrong with postponing this resolution about the limitation until such time as it is actually before the House for consideration? This is a gestation of what we are going to say, of cutting down. Why do we not then and there, when the continuing resolution on the appropriations may be considered, make the determination rather than adopt this resolution at this time—which nobody seems to know exactly the meaning of?

Mr. MAHON. Everyone who will take the time to read the proposal, I think, will be able to ascertain what it means. It is on page 61 of the bill. I know the capabilities of the gentleman from Colorado. It is very plain here. It is a governmentwide proposal. It simply says:

Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Texas another question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the Chair.

I am sorry I cannot yield any further time to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I just want to make a quick announcement at this time. I do not oppose the rule. However, when the matter comes up for debate, I will introduce an amendment to strike title IV and I will make my arguments at the appropriate time.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) whatever time I have remaining.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi. I will not need that much time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very much disturbed about this legislation as it pertains to our veterans' program. We all know there is a war going on in Vietnam, but few people realize the impact of the Vietnam war on our veterans' program. Demands on every major program of the VA are up over last year. Listed are the comparisons between the first 9 months of fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969:

GAINS IN KEY WORKLOAD ITEMS EXPERIENCED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY DURING THE FIRST 9 MONTHS OF FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND 1969

Workload items	1st 9 months of—		Increase
	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	
Hospital care in VA and Non-VA facilities:			
Admissions.....	498,518	512,839	+14,321
Discharges.....	501,266	515,553	+14,287
Patients treated.....	615,209	623,131	+7,922
Average monthly turnover rate (percent):			
VA hospitals.....	54.7	59.8	+5.1
Non-VA hospitals.....	96.1	110.5	+4.4
Percent of VA hospital discharges to post-hospital care.....	46.4	47.3	+0.9
Nursing home care:			
Average daily census:			
Total.....	7,932	8,637	+705
VA.....	3,429	3,683	-----
Community.....	2,732	2,826	-----
State.....	1,771	2,128	-----
Patients treated (total).....	17,035	18,661	-----
Outpatient visits, staff and fee:			
Total.....	4,828,397	5,115,076	+286,679
Compensation and pension.....	221,947	250,460	-----
Outpatient treatment.....	2,465,612	2,553,777	-----
Posthospital care.....	790,727	894,692	-----
Prebed care.....	64,566	72,227	-----
Need for hospital or domiciliary care.....	807,659	866,880	-----
All other.....	477,886	477,040	-----
Dental examinations (total).....	482,916	504,959	+22,043
Staff.....	478,477	492,857	-----
Fee.....	4,439	12,102	-----

GAINS IN KEY WORKLOAD ITEMS EXPERIENCED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY DURING THE FIRST 9 MONTHS OF FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND 1969—Con.

Workload items	1st 9 months of—		Increase
	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1969	
Dental treatment cases (total).....	196,200	211,700	+15,500
Staff.....	189,855	198,926	+22,844
Fee.....	6,345	12,774	+6,429
Patients receiving new prosthetic appliances.....	264,583	287,427	+22,844
Social work caseload (3d quarter average).....	98,733	105,732	+6,999
Mental hygiene clinic (active cases Mar. 31).....	70,414	74,319	+3,905
Clinical laboratory weighted work units.....	43,730,643	48,928,304	+5,197,661
Voluntary service man-hours (1st 6 months).....	4,705,752	4,965,733	+259,981
Prescriptions filled.....	7,428,030	8,431,043	+1,003,013
Residents in training program (non-career):			
Physicians.....	3,515	4,000	+485
Dentists.....	56	66	+10
Interns in training:			
Physicians.....	374	506	+132
Dentists.....	45	60	+15

GAINS IN KEY WORKLOAD ITEMS EXPERIENCED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS BENEFITS DURING THE FIRST 9 MONTHS OF FISCAL YEARS 1968 AND 1969

Compensation and pension: claims received.....	1,424,089	1,650,202	+226,113
Education:			
Applications and authorizations.....	1,574,062	2,019,517	+445,455
Counseling actions.....	133,226	155,773	+22,547
Loan guarantee:			
Appraisal requests.....	247,951	266,287	+18,336
Eligibility determinations.....	434,823	437,897	+3,074
GI loan applications.....	191,317	188,449	-2,868
GI loans closed.....	175,518	169,118	-6,400
Gardianship: Beneficiaries (total as of Mar. 31).....	668,667	730,024	+61,357
Contact:			
Personal interviews.....	1,992,213	2,105,205	+112,992
Telephone interviews.....	3,238,510	5,025,607	+1,787,097
Administrative:			
Incoming mail.....	40,762,970	44,972,017	+4,209,047
Applications processed.....	457,708	565,982	+108,274
Folder lookups.....	18,631,179	20,329,494	+1,698,315

We get 75,000 new veterans discharged each month. Every single program the VA is in has gone up. Yet, we have not added a bed in a hospital. The VA hospital system is receiving the casualties directly from the military and this is a substantial added burden. Last year the VA hoped to get 4,000 additional employees for kidney machines and heart machines and intensive care, and so on. Instead of getting those 4,000, they were ordered to go back to the 1966 level, which meant getting rid of about 4,000 employees.

In the second session of the 90th Congress at the time the surtax was imposed, an agreement was reached between the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee that personnel levels in the Federal Government would be rolled back to the June 30, 1966, level. This was accomplished by section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968.

When the provisions of the conference agreement came to our attention we found that every agency of the Federal

Government was to be placed on a personnel reduction formula until the entire Federal Government reached the June 30, 1966, level. Since VA is a rapid turnover agency, the agency would have been required to remain on the reduction formula for approximately 30 months and would have cost approximately 30,000 employees. This would have led to the closing of at least 15 hospitals. The conference was reopened and a commitment was secured from the conferees and the Bureau of the Budget that the personnel ceilings would be applied agency by agency, therefore, VA was required to remain on the reduction formula until it reached its own June 30, 1966, personnel level which required the reduction of about 5,000 employees rather than 30,000.

VA has reached its June 30, 1966, level and was required to give up its request in the fiscal year 1968 budget for about 5,000 additional personnel mostly in medical which were needed to install new programs.

The Johnson budget was prepared under the assumption that the personnel ceiling would be removed, and the Johnson estimates contained funds for 3,587 additional employees in medical at a cost of \$31,567,000, an increase of 498 in medical and prosthetic research at a cost of \$5 million, an increase of 378 in the Veterans Benefits Office at a cost of \$3,200,000. The revised budget removed these recommended increases which, of course, are not needed unless the personnel ceiling can be removed.

I would remind the Members of this House that virtually all the legislation which has been enacted for veterans in recent years, and particularly that of the Vietnam era, has passed the Congress unanimously. We meant for these returning veterans to have the best that we could provide and this, Mr. Speaker, is going to cost some money, not only in benefits but in employee and personnel for the agency which administers these benefits. There is a greatly increased workload in all areas of the Veterans' Administration which deal with adjusted benefits. There is a backlog in the adjudication of claims, the highest which has existed since the end of World War II. If we vote in any way to curtail the activities of individuals processing these claims or the general administrative work of the Veterans' Administration, service which is already deplorable in some areas will decline even more and the Congress will be flooded with claims which in some instances will be justified, of unwarranted delays or lack of attention, and a general breakdown of handling of claims for compensation and pension, education, loan guaranty, insurance, and so forth.

Members should not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the casualties of the Vietnam war are being treated promptly in Veterans' Administration hospitals without the necessity of building a single new hospital. These new patients have been absorbed in the general workload of the Veterans' Administration and we are all happy and proud of that fact, but we cannot permit this agency in the middle of a war to suffer a cut that will impair its operations. The Subcommittee on

Hospitals has just concluded a series of hearings in which every facet and phase of the hospital program of the Veterans' Administration has been carefully explored. The subcommittee heard eminent deans of outstanding medical schools, perhaps the best in the country, testify that the patient-employee ratio in the Veterans' Administration has reached shocking proportions, sometimes one-half, and in some instances one-third of what is found in well-run community hospitals or a hospital affiliated with a medical school. Without additional personnel and funds it will be necessary to provide further cutbacks in this great medical program which, I am sure, most of us upon mature reflection do not want to see occur.

Our Subcommittee on Hospitals also found great deficiencies in financial resources for research and medical education, both of which are vital if the type and quality of care which our veterans deserve is to be maintained.

Veterans organizations are concerned about this. The text of telegrams from veterans organizations are as follows:

The American Legion is gravely concerned about the ability of the Veterans Administration to carry out its mission to war veterans and their dependents unless that agency is exempted from the ceilings on budget expenditures for FY 1970 as proposed in Title 4 of H.R. 11400.

Some 70,000 new veterans, many of whom are disabled, are returning to civilian life each month from the Vietnam war. This, together with increasing workloads in benefits and service to all war veterans, is severely impairing VA's ability to effectively administer its programs. The cost of war and veterans benefits—a delayed cost of war—are essential obligations of our government.

The American Legion urgently recommends your support of an amendment to H.R. 11400 to be offered by Congressman Olin E. Teague to remove VA from spending and personnel ceilings so that the veterans program will not be further jeopardized.

HERALD E. STRINGER,

Director, National Legislative Commission.

Veterans Administration will be unable to meet the many demands resulting from Vietnam war under the proposed ceiling for fiscal year 1970, as provided in H.R. 11400, supplemental VA appropriation bill. Urgently recommend your support and vote of Teague amendment which will eliminate ceiling on veterans programs.

RICHARD HOMAN,

Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The 280,000 members of the Disabled American Veterans urge you to support an amendment to be offered by Congressman Olin E. Teague, exempting the Veterans Administration from the spending ceiling proposed in H.R. 11400. The increased demands on the Veterans Administration caused by the casualties of the Vietnam war and the need for updating legislation makes such an exemption essential for the welfare of America's disabled veterans.

CHARLES L. HUBER,

National Director of Legislation.

AMVETS urge you to support the Teague amendment to H.R. 11400 which will exempt the VA from the ceiling on expenditures proposed under this legislation. The Vietnam war is creating 70,000 new veterans each month, as long as it continues this number will grow. Certainly our young, brave veterans are entitled to the full range of benefits already granted by the Congress in its wisdom

and to proper service for their future needs. We call upon you to represent them now as unselfishly as they represented America in her most difficult war. There is no ceiling on death, injury or loss of civilian pursuits, how can there be a ceiling on the compassion of our country? AMVETS look to you to speak for the new veterans of this Nation.

JOSEPH V. FERRINO,
National Commander.

MAY 20, 1969.

We support wholeheartedly the amendment you are going to offer today to H.R. 11400 to exempt the VA from the ceiling on expenditures proposed in this legislation. We have sent telegrams to key Members of Congress stating our support of this amendment.

VICTOR V. MILLER,

National Commander, Veterans of World War One, U.S.A., Inc.

So this is the kind of situation we are in in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I appreciate very much the words of the chairman. I had an amendment, which I am not going to offer, with the understanding that when our veterans bill comes along they will give consideration to these facts.

It does not make any difference if Congress gives VA all the money on earth if VA does not have sufficient employees to run the hospitals and provide the care necessary and handle pending claims. On the other side, it does not make any difference to provide all the employees, without the money to pay for them.

In the other body, in the last couple of weeks, they have been very critical of the VA not doing enough to tell our veterans what is going on. The situation today is completely different from that of World War II. When the servicemen came home from World War II they sat around in barracks for a week, and had plenty of time to be counseled. Today, when they come back from Europe, Korea, or Vietnam, they are right out of the service.

What we have done is go to Vietnam to establish centers. The results have been very good. We should have information centers in Korea. We should have information centers in Germany.

The Veterans' Administration maintains a staff of 10 contact representatives at seven locations in Vietnam. As of April 30, 1969, a total of 718,164 soon to be discharged GI's had been oriented on their potential GI benefits. Since the inception of this program more than 77,000 personal interviews have been conducted and almost 30,000 actual applications for benefits have been filed by GI's before departure from Vietnam. VA representatives assigned to duty in Vietnam are all volunteers and their tours are for 6 months' duration. Two VA contact representatives have been killed in Vietnam while carrying out their responsibilities.

CONTACT ASSISTANCE IN MILITARY HOSPITALS

The VA is conducting a comprehensive bedside assistance program while wounded GI's are still hospitalized in 115 military hospitals. During fiscal year 1968 more than 7,000 visits were made to military hospitals and personal interviews were conducted with 61,867 disabled servicemen. Vocational rehabilitation applications totaled 20,269 and claims for compensation approximated 25,000.

CONTACT SERVICE AT MILITARY SEPARATION
POINTS

Preseparation group orientation on benefits is provided at 288 military separation points each month. During fiscal year 1968 almost 8,000 visits were made to these separation points by VA contact representatives, over 496,000 servicemen were oriented and 70,265 personal interviews were conducted.

LOCATIONS OF VIETNAM CONTACT CENTERS

Air Force: Tan Son Nhut, Bien Hoa, Cam Ranh Bay, and De Nang.

Army: Cam Ranh Bay and Long Binh.
Marine: De Nang.

Itinerant service: Phan Rang, Tuy Hoa, Phyl Cat, Chu Lai, U.S. Naval Hospital, De Nang, and 29th Evacuation Hospital, Saigon.

Yet in this today there has been cut \$500,000 off this kind of program, when they have the biggest backlog they have had at any time in the VA program.

I want to say to the chairman that I will appear before your committee when this budget comes along, because I do not believe they are treating the VA right.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The main problem here, I believe, which the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) has so well presented, is that of personnel limitations which were fixed in section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act last year.

Let me say that in appropriation bills this year for the fiscal year 1970, we will probably propose to recommend some set-aside of that provision of the law as to personnel. We have already included such a set-aside provision in the versions of the bills which have been marked up to date. We expect to report the first one tomorrow. So the personnel problem can, I feel confident, be handled selectively and appropriately.

With respect to the amount of funds needed, that will be a matter for the House to decide. I am sure all of us are going to give our veterans the benefit of the doubt and see to it that they get ample funds for the various veterans programs.

Let me read to the committee the provision on personnel that we would propose to include in the bill making appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. It reads:

Positions in the agencies covered by this Act—

Which would include the Veterans' Administration—

whether financed from funds contained in this Act or from other sources, may be filled during the fiscal year 1970 without regard to the provisions of Section 201 of Public Law 90-364—

That is the tax bill—

and such positions shall not be taken into consideration in determining numbers of employees under subsection (a) of that section or numbers of vacancies under subsection (b) of that section.

In other words, it sets aside the limitation on personnel which is in operation at this time, and which is permanent law.

It is, as I said, prepared to include this provision in the bill for the forthcoming fiscal year. I believe this will meet the situation adequately as to personnel ceiling restrictions on the Veterans' Administration.

(Mr. TEAGUE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, together with the colloquy which has taken place between the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS), and the other gentlemen, has ably explained this resolution which is pending before the House.

To some extent my understanding is just a little different, and I will mention that for what it may be worth.

I believe this is an unusual procedure, to handle it in this way today. It is necessary, for otherwise the resolution would have to lie on the desk for 24 hours, in order to have general debate.

I believe the approach of providing the administration with a top ceiling is probably the first time that is has ever been placed into effect by the Congress, as to a ceiling limit for what they could spend. Last year we made them cut certain amounts, but this language, under title IV, will mean that they cannot spend more than \$192.9 billion.

Now, where I differ a little bit, if I understood the colloquy so far as the Veterans' Administration or anything else is concerned, is that this language does not apply to the action taken by the Congress of the United States. In our authorization bill for the veterans, we can exceed the money, in that authorization bill, that is set forth in the budget. If it is appropriated, that money can be spent, and the \$192.9 billion would be increased by whatever action Congress takes in authorizing and appropriating money over the budget top of \$192.9 billion.

I ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. SMITH of California. In other words, we do not bind the Congress. We can come in next week and change this. We can repeal it. We can add to it. We can do whatever we want with any single authorization or appropriation bill, and the veterans will be taken care of when the independent offices appropriation bill comes in, after the authorizing legislation has been approved.

So other than that, Mr. Speaker, I think it is up to the Congress to cooperate. We have already taken one action in the maritime authorization bill, which increased the money over and above the budget request. That amount, if appropriated, will raise this ceiling by the difference between what the administration asked for and what this House of Representatives asked for last week. Next week we will have the space bill. A rule was granted on it yesterday. There is

an additional amount in the space program, in the authorization bill, over and above the budget request. If that is approved by the House of Representatives and the Senate and if the money is appropriated over and above that figure, in my opinion, that will increase the \$192.9 billion. If I am not correct in that, I would like to have somebody straighten me out.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I think the Committee on Appropriations and its chairman ought to be congratulated for the manner in which they are handling the spending ceiling this year. The chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and Mr. COLMER, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules (Mr. SMITH) have explained in detail how this ceiling will work.

This ceiling limits the administration and the Bureau of the Budget, but it places no limitation on any action that the Congress might choose to take either to raise or to lower in any instance any agency's budget. We all, to a man, share a sincere concern for our veterans. I know that this Congress is not going to be insensitive to the needs of our veterans or anyone else. We are doing a better job with placing a limitation on expenditures this year in this manner, in my personal opinion, than we did last year, because we placed too much of a burden for reducing expenditures on the executive branch of the Government and did not shoulder the responsibility in the legislative. We can raise or lower the budget any time we want to here in the Congress. It is up to the Congress, and that is where the responsibility ought to be.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Would you agree that by labeling this as a limitation on appropriations it is a misnomer and actually it is solely a limitation on expenditures and not a limitation on appropriations?

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not think it is a limitation on appropriations.

Mr. FARBSTEN. I admit it is not a limitation on appropriations but just on expenditures. You are calling it a limitation on appropriations, and this is a misnomer.

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not think the language says that. I do not think anybody says that. It is a limitation on the amount of money that the administration can spend in fiscal year 1970 unless Congress raises it or lowers it.

Mr. FARBSTEN. The gentleman evidently agrees with me except that he uses more words than I to say so.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH of California. It is going to be awfully tough for the administration under the present setup to live under this figure. Congress will have to help in every way that it can.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 322, nays 53, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—322

Abbitt	Cunningham	Harvey
Abernethy	Daddario	Hechler, W. Va.
Adair	Daniel, Va.	Henderson
Adams	Daniels, N.J.	Hicks
Addabbo	Davis, Ga.	Holifield
Albert	Davis, Wis.	Horton
Alexander	de la Garza	Hosmer
Anderson,	Delaney	Hull
Tenn.	Dellenback	Hungate
Andrews, Ala.	Denney	Hunt
Andrews,	Dennis	Hutchinson
N. Dak.	Devine	Ichord
Annunzio	Dickinson	Jacobs
Arends	Diggs	Jarman
Ashbrook	Donohue	Johnson
Aspinall	Dorn	Johnson, Calif.
Ayres	Dowdy	Johnson, Pa.
Beall, Md.	Downing	Jonas
Belcher	Dulski	Jones, Ala.
Bell, Calif.	Duncan	Jones, N.C.
Bennett	Dwyer	Jones, Tenn.
Berry	Eckhardt	Karsh
Betts	Edmondson	Kazen
Bevill	Edwards, Ala.	Kee
Biaggi	Erlenborn	Keith
Biester	Esch	King
Blackburn	Eshleman	Kleppe
Blanton	Evans, Colo.	Kluczynski
Blatnik	Evins, Tenn.	Kuykendall
Boggs	Fallon	Kyl
Boland	Fascell	Kyros
Bow	Feighan	Landgrebe
Brasco	Findley	Landrum
Bray	Fish	Langen
Brinkley	Fisher	Latta
Brock	Flood	Lennon
Brooks	Flowers	Lipscomb
Broomfield	Flynt	Lloyd
Brotzman	Foley	Long, La.
Brown, Mich.	Ford, Gerald R.	Long, Md.
Brown, Ohio	Ford,	Lowenstein
Broyhill, N.C.	William D.	Lukens
Broyhill, Va.	Foreman	McClure
Buchanan	Fountain	McCulloch
Burke, Fla.	Frelinghuysen	McDade
Burke, Mass.	Friedel	McDonald,
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton, Pa.	Mich.
Burlison, Mo.	Fulton, Tenn.	McEwen
Burton, Utah	Fuqua	McFall
Bush	Galifianakis	McKneally
Button	Garmatz	Macdonald,
Byrnes, Wis.	Gettys	Mass.
Cabell	Glaime	MacGregor
Caffery	Gibbons	Madden
Camp	Goldwater	Mahon
Carter	Gonzalez	Maillard
Casey	Goodling	Mann
Cederberg	Gray	Marsh
Celler	Green, Oreg.	Martin
Chamberlain	Griffin	Mathias
Chappell	Griffiths	Matsunaga
Clausen,	Grover	May
Don H.	Gude	Mayne
Clawson, Del	Hagan	Michel
Cleveland	Haley	Miller, Calif.
Cohelan	Halpern	Miller, Ohio
Collins	Hamilton	Mills
Colmer	Hamer-	Mink
Conable	schmidt	Minshall
Conte	Hanley	Mize
Corbett	Hanna	Mizell
Corman	Hansen, Idaho	Mollohan
Coughlin	Hansen, Wash.	Monagan
Cramer	Harsha	Montgomery

Morgan	Roth
Morton	Roubush
Myers	Roybal
Natcher	Ruppe
Nelsen	Ruth
O'Konski	St Germain
O'Neill, Mass.	St. Onge
Passman	Satterfield
Patman	Schadeberg
Patten	Scherle
Pelly	Scott
Perkins	Sebellus
Pettis	Shriver
Pickle	Sikes
Pike	Sisk
Pirnie	Slack
Poage	Smith, Calif.
Poff	Smith, Iowa
Preyer, N.C.	Snyder
Price, Tex.	Springer
Pryor, Ark.	Stafford
Pucinski	Staggers
Purcell	Stanton
Quie	Steed
Quillen	Steiger, Ariz.
Rarick	Steiger, Wis.
Reid, Ill.	Stephens
Reid, N.Y.	Stubblefield
Rhodes	Stuckey
Rivers	Sullivan
Roberts	Symington
Robison	Taft
Rogers, Colo.	Talcott
Rogers, Fla.	Taylor
Rooney, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Rostenkowski	Teague, Tex.

NAYS—53

Anderson,	Gilbert	Olsen
Calif.	Gross	Ottinger
Barrett	Hall	Podell
Bingham	Hathaway	Price, Ill.
Bolling	Hawkins	Rees
Brademas	Hays	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Ronan
Burton, Calif.	Koch	Rooney, Pa.
Byrne, Pa.	McCarthy	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Meeds	Ryan
Clay	Mikva	Scheuer
Conyers	Minish	Schneebeil
Derwinski	Moorhead	Stokes
Edwards, Calif.	Mosher	Thompson, N.J.
Ellberg	Moss	Tunney
Farbstein	Nix	Van Deerlin
Fraser	Obey	Yates
Gaydos	O'Hara	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—58

Anderson, Ill.	Hébert	Pollock
Ashley	Heckler, Mass.	Powell
Baring	Helstoski	Railsback
Bates	Hogan	Randall
Cahill	Howard	Relfel
Carey	Kirwan	Riegle
Clancy	Leggett	Rodino
Clark	Lujan	Rumsfeld
Collier	McClory	Sandman
Cowger	McCloskey	Saylor
Culver	McMillan	Schwengel
Dawson	Meskill	Shipley
Dent	Morse	Skubitz
Dingell	Murphy, Ill.	Smith, N.Y.
Edwards, La.	Murphy, N.Y.	Stratton
Frey	Nedzi	Watson
Gallagher	Nichols	Wiggins
Green, Pa.	O'Neal, Ga.	Wilson, Bob
Gubser	Pepper	
Hastings	Philbin	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Gubser.

Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, Wis.
Tieman
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watts
Welcker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson,
Charles H.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Relfel.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Powell with Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Hogan.

Mr. BRASCO changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11400, with Mr. HOLFIELD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through line 7 on page 2 of the bill.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I do feel I want to express, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, my concern regarding the excessive use of supplementals. You know, we have reached a point here where the ink is no more dry on the regular appropriations bills until we get the first supplemental. Then we get the second and the third and finally 30 days before the end of the fiscal year here we are up with another massive supplemental bill.

I recognize that we in Congress do take certain actions that sometimes do require consideration in the area of supplementals, but I just want to tell the House and the members of my committee that I do not like this approach at all. I am very unhappy with it. I think the time has come when we in the Committee on Appropriations should control ourselves better as to the handling of supplementals. Further, what we ought to do is tell the executive agencies not to come up with supplementals as prolifically as they do now.

In my opinion about one or two supplementals a year is enough. I am expressing my opposition to a supplemental bill in these amounts, 30 days before the end of the fiscal year in some instances with agencies trying to get money that was already denied in their regular appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, I object to this approach and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that

something can be done to control what I consider to be an abuse of the supplemental appropriations procedure.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of supplementals.

I would say that with respect to the matter of restoration of reductions made last year, less than 1 percent of the funds in this bill represent money for functions which were reduced in appropriations made by Congress last year. The amount so involved is some \$34 million. It is only about one-third of 1 percent of the approximately \$12 billion cut last year from the requests for new funds for fiscal year 1969. That is a pretty good record, I would say.

We always have a supplemental bill for the current fiscal year in the new session. This one, it is true, has been delayed somewhat longer than usual. I agree that we should avoid supplementals wherever and whenever we reasonably can. Most of this pending supplemental is for costs associated with the war in Vietnam, or for pay increases voted and put into effect last year, plus a few other items that are either mandatory under basic law or rest on other requirements that the committee found justifiable.

But I appreciate the views of the gentleman from Michigan. Some supplementals are more or less inevitable for a variety of reasons. The basis for those in this bill are, of course, explained in the committee report accompanying the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Strike out title I (beginning on page 2, line 1, and ending on page 3, line 5), and redesignate the succeeding provisions of the bill accordingly.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out title I of the bill entitled "Military Operations in Southeast Asia" which would appropriate in supplemental funds some \$1.2 billion for the war in Vietnam.

This amendment is also sponsored by other concerned Members of the House, including my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN), and the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is appropriate at this point because it offers the only means that the House has to vote on the conduct of the war in Vietnam. The power of the purse is the one power that we in the House of Representatives have to call a halt to the continued infusion of men and money into the conflict in Southeast Asia—and the continued sacrifice of lives. If we do not seize upon this opportunity, then we will once again have abdicated the responsibility which we have to review and control the administration's exercise of foreign policy.

Again this year, as for each of the past 5 years, we have before us a request for supplemental appropriations to prosecute the war in Vietnam. For the fifth

year in a row the costs of the war have been underestimated in the initial budget presentation.

Mr. Chairman, one-third of the funds contained in this bill, \$1.234 billion out of \$3.783 billion is for military operations in Southeast Asia under title I. The increased funds are needed to pay for increased troop strength over that originally estimated and budgeted for fiscal year 1969. Other funds are required because there has been an increase by 50 percent in bombings by B-52's in South Vietnam following the cessation of the bombing in the north.

A greater tonnage of bombs has been used in Vietnam than the United States used in all of World War II.

Despite the President's statement last week that the United States does not seek a military victory, the level of our military involvement in Southeast Asia is no less today than it was 1 year ago. The brutal fact that over 12,000 American servicemen have been killed since the Paris peace talks began is proof that the level of violence and destruction has not subsided. Witness the loss of 43 American lives and the wounding of 290 other American soldiers in the 11 assaults upon Apbin Hill, known as "Hamburger Hill" since about May 10.

Although the American people expressed their opposition to the continuance of the war through the political process last year, there has been no fundamental change in policy which would lead to the disengagement of American forces.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN), for bringing this matter at issue before the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. It is obvious to every single person on this floor that unless we slow down and reduce the level of violence and the level of expenditures in Southeast Asia, we will not be able to cope with the other problems confronting this Nation.

I believe the gentleman from New York is to be highly commended by all of us for having the insight to give us an opportunity to express ourselves at this very important point in time in the war in Vietnam.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York and ask the gentleman for his permission to join in cosponsorship of this amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the support of the gentleman from New York for this amendment. I believe the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON) has pointed out very cogently that, as long as the war continues to drain some \$27 or \$28 billion as it already has done in fiscal year 1969, according to the report of the Committee on Appropriations, the necessary resources will not be de-

voted to solution of the pressing problems which confront us domestically.

This bill before us is inadequate in its treatment of domestic programs. The rent supplement program, for instance, was funded at less than 50 percent of the Johnson administration's budget request. Yet this bill provides no supplemental appropriations for rent supplements.

The section 246 interest subsidy program for rental and cooperative housing is still \$10 million under the authorization.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that this war end. By voting against supplemental appropriations for it, we will tell the administration that, with all the urgent domestic problems facing our country, it will have to get along in Vietnam with the paltry amounts of money which have already been appropriated for fiscal year 1969—some \$27 billion or \$28 billion.

The only way to force a change in policy is to refuse to approve the allocation of any additional funds for the war.

As long as Congress continues to acquiesce in appropriations for the war, as long as Congress continues to rubber-stamp administration policy, then Congress must share the responsibility with the administration for the continuation of that war. If Congress wants to bring the war to a close, it has the power to do so.

Mr. Chairman, in 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968 I voted against supplemental appropriation bills which permitted the war to be expanded and escalated. I shall do so again today. It is time to halt the violence and destruction which have claimed the lives of so many Americans and Vietnamese.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as everyone knows, our Government is seeking to bring the war in Vietnam to a satisfactory conclusion. Peace talks are underway in Paris, and we certainly do not want to weaken the position of our Government at this strategic time. It is hoped that more and more of the fighting will be assumed by the South Vietnamese forces. This bill contains a quarter of a billion dollars for strengthening and modernizing the South Vietnamese Army in order to better equip them for taking over the fighting.

Mr. Chairman, it would be most ill-advised to pull the rug out from under our forces in Vietnam, so to speak, and out from under our negotiators at the Paris talks.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we can vote on this amendment at this time, and vote the amendment down.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman how much of the additional appropriations, particularly as they relate to military pay costs for additional personnel, are for the addition of troops beyond those presently in Vietnam?

Mr. MAHON. There are no funds for the addition of troops beyond those presently in Vietnam.

Mr. OTTINGER. There is no money in here for additional troops?

Mr. MAHON. No, that is correct.

Mr. OTTINGER. I thank the gentleman for yield.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I speak today because the confluence of recent events have made the timing of this discussion fateful for the country.

Last March 26, in a speech on the floor of this House I said:

Soon we in the Congress will be asked again for the funds to continue prosecution of the war, and then, as before, Members of Congress will face the most unacceptable of alternatives; for they will be told that to refuse to appropriate money to protect our fighting men is to consign to death yet more of those Americans who are surely among those least deserving to die—those Americans who are carrying out the orders of their Government with a valor and loyalty in the face of the great difficulties and uncertainties of the situation that must rank with the highest such response of our history.

Yet valor and loyalty do not make wrong things right, or senseless policies sensible, or hopeless pursuits hopeful. So there will be those who feel that to vote money for the further prosecution of the war is not to protect lives, but indeed to make more certain that more lives will be pointlessly lost.

It is the imminence of this decision and the existence of stalemate and escalation in Paris and Vietnam that leads me then to urge the President the following steps:

First, the United States should begin at the earliest possible moment to withdraw with all deliberate speed as large a part of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam as would be consistent with the continued safety of those men who remain behind.

Second, the United States should make clear, to those whom we have supported and opposed alike, that it is our intention to continue to withdraw American troops from South Vietnam until none shall remain, providing only that during this continuing withdrawal the Government of North Vietnam and the Vietcong will participate in good faith efforts to resolve by negotiation the negotiable questions mentioned above.

Third, the United States should reiterate its willingness to assist in the relocation of people who do not wish to remain in South Vietnam under new circumstances that must arise in any peace settlement, and to assist through international agencies in the reconstruction of the land devastated by so many years of war.

There has been hesitation to begin the removal of American troops on the theory that to take such a step while negotiations are in progress could weaken the bargaining position of the United States and of the Government of South Vietnam. But I have become convinced that the opposite is in fact the case, unless we are still seeking to negotiate what are not in fact negotiable goals.

For if in fact the early withdrawal of American troops is one of our objectives in the negotiations, to begin that withdrawal could hardly be called a step away from achieving that one of our objectives. It even seems likely that to begin realizing that objective might well make it easier to realize other objectives as well.

The carrot of continuing the American withdrawal should increase the incentive for the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese to negotiate in good faith; while the stick of beginning the American withdrawal could hardly fail to make clear to the South Vietnamese government that we finally mean what we have been saying for so many years—that the war in Vietnam will be de-Americanized. That simple fact should prove a greater inducement to the government of South Vietnam to negotiate in good faith than all the exhortations that words can construct. It would at least remove their greatest incentive not to negotiate: the confidence that as long as there are not successful negotiations there will be an American army on hand to keep them in power.

Therefore, should the President begin the withdrawal of American troops and accompany that withdrawal with public declarations such as those proposed here, he would, I believe, facilitate negotiations rather than hinder them, and thus he would make a major start toward removing the barriers that separate the American people from the most nearly satisfactory resolution of their most difficult dilemma.

In short, it now seems clear that the beginning of the withdrawal of American troops would in fact strengthen our bargaining position if we want to get all the Vietnamese involved to work out the quickest possible way to end the war and the least painful way to begin the reconstruction.

In any event, once these steps were taken and America's purposes were clear, there would be new unity at home in support of those who are negotiating and new hope for a healing of the spirit of this land; and there would be at last an irrefutable rebuttal to those who have denied the efficacy of the democratic process and who would tear it down the pretext that it has collapsed or has never worked.

The money necessary for the "protection" of the lives of those Americans still in the combat area would then be voted without the haunting sense that each dollar proclaimed as protection might in fact increase the likelihood of destruction.

Mr. Chairman, Americans ought today to be feeling great pride because our fighting men gained what is called a great victory in a battle in Vietnam.

Instead, many millions of Americans feel a gnawing and growing wound at their heart, because in fact several hundred more of our finest young men have become casualties in what must be the most irrelevant battle in our history since the Battle of New Orleans. How bitter the taste—and the fruits—of such a "victory" at such a price.

But what is most tragic about this "victory" is that the Battle of Hamburger Hill is simply a concentrated dose of what goes on all the time in less concentrated form, what goes on pointlessly, dangerously, and apparently interminably.

So the moment of "the most unacceptable of alternatives" has now arrived as expected, and once again we are asked for new funds to fight more such battles, to seek more such "victories" on the fevered road to disaster.

And since the withdrawal of American troops has not begun, since the President has not felt he could state the national goals in Vietnam in a fashion that would suggest that the beginning of such withdrawal is imminent since we still seem unwilling to use negotiations to pursue those things that are negotiable—above all, since military commanders still feel

free to spill unmeasured blood to gain transient possession of distant hilltops—in these circumstances, I am convinced that to vote more money is to squander more lives.

I cannot believe that anyone here or anywhere else thinks that it is in the national interest to continue this war, to pile up more bodies on more Hamburger Hills. But that is what we authorize when we vote more money at this bloody moment.

We do not "strengthen our bargaining position" by such a vote, on the contrary, we make it less likely that the President will read correctly the national will to get out of Vietnam. We give the green light, in fact, to the continuation of the policies that have led to all this unredeemable slaughter.

Many of us will not do this. We will vote to save American lives. We will vote to salvage the security and honor of the Nation. The only way to do that under the present circumstances is to vote "no" on this appropriation and on all subsequent appropriations to prosecute the war. We vote no with the prayer that these votes will help persuade the President to reverse the course before the national unraveling becomes irreversible.

If the Congress abdicates its obligation to make this judgment on the national policy, it will do so to the peril of this country that we love next only to liberty and justice themselves.

So it seems to me that this is the place and this is the moment to say "No; not another dollar—not another profligate expenditure of lives. Begin instead today the withdrawing of troops, the de-Americanizing of the war, and begin at home with the pressing national agenda so long and so dangerously deferred and already so difficult to address." Then we can close ranks in support of the President, in support of his negotiators. We can vote the money for the closing-out in Vietnam and for the starting-in at home. We can offer protection for the South Vietnamese Government against massacres during transition if it will seek peace, or we can depart and let it tend to its own future if it prefers to fight. We can, in short, stop imposing a government on the people of South Vietnam and a war on the people of that country and our own.

I concluded my remarks here on March 26 by reading something that had been said by Senator Robert F. Kennedy a year ago. I read it again now haunted by the sense that grows more prophetic with each tragic day:

I am concerned . . . that the course we are following at the present time is deeply wrong . . . I am concerned that, at the end of it all, there will only be more Americans killed, more of our treasure spilled out, and because of the bitterness and hatred on every side of this war, more hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese slaughtered; so that they may say, as Tacitus said of Rome: "They made a desert and called it peace." I don't think that's satisfactory for the United States of America. I do not think that is what this country stands for.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, in March of 1968 the American people made emphatically clear that they no longer would support a government that persisted in the further prosecution of the Vietnam war.

Here we are today—15,000 American lives and \$27 billion later—being asked to approve more money for more killing in Vietnam. May I respectfully submit that the new administration and this Congress have failed the American people.

Earlier this year, I said on the floor of this House that I will oppose any appropriations for the further prosecution of the Vietnam war—that I will not vote a single dollar for more killing. The manner in which this supplemental appropriations bill is presented does not permit a separate vote on title I which is devoted exclusively to military operations in Southeast Asia. There are non-military appropriations in this bill which deserve support but we are told that such items are inseparable from the war appropriation. I resent the intention and effect of such a procedure. I do not think it shows proper respect for those Members who deeply oppose our involvement in Vietnam and I regret to say that it appears to show a contempt for the outrage and agony that the American people feel over the continuation of this unconscionable war.

It is because of this procedure, knowing that any amendment to strike title I from this bill will fail, that I have no alternative but to vote "No" against the entire appropriations bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ECKHARDT TO THE
AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ECKHARDT to the amendment offered by Mr. RYAN: Strike out lines 1 through 5 on page 3.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, for at least 2 years now I have had deep concern about our involvement in Vietnam. I feel most sincerely that what we have been doing has many mistaken premises and has extended beyond reasonable bounds activity of the U.S. Government which is our benefit. Nevertheless, I have voted for all appropriations which included support of the troops in Vietnam. I have come to the point today, however, where I feel so strongly, along with some of my colleagues who have spoken here before, that I must express my protest against a wrongness of direction and a wrongness of pumping funds into that area.

Yet I am not willing to vote for an amendment that would strike all of title I, which includes military personnel, Army; military personnel, Navy; military personnel, Air Force; and also includes operation and maintenance, Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, because I feel that many of these items necessarily must be spent or have been spent with respect to the necessary requirements of the personnel in the field.

However, I note that the items involved for military personnel, Army, are at \$110

million; Navy, \$14,500,000; Air Force, \$115 million; and then operations, \$96,310,000.

Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps, \$15,390,000.

Operation and maintenance, Air Force, \$242,700,000.

But the procurement item is far greater than any of these items and is \$640,100,000. The procurement item is largely prospective, and I believe that this is the place at which we should make our point, that continuation of procurement, in order to prosecute an effort on the part of the United States that is harmful, in my opinion, to the Nation, that that amount of procurement in this bill should be cut out as a strong statement against continuation of the war unchanged and unabated. For that reason I have offered the amendment to the amendment which would cut out the prospective portion of title I, the procurement section.

I would appreciate an "aye" vote. I believe this is a proper way to show we want to turn around, but at the same time we would not be withdrawing support of men in the field at this time.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and I commend him for the amendment he has offered. It offers a welcome opportunity for those of us who want to register at this time our strong feelings against the Vietnam war, and our belief that scaling down of the violence will help produce peace. I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, as well as the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. There is plenty of money already available to do whatever is necessary to provide the forces now in Vietnam with what they need.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as concurring in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. To my mind it makes good sense.

I do not think we should deny to our soldiers medical care, food, clothing, and housing. I do not think we should deny the needs of our personnel who are in the armed services, deny them the necessities of life.

However, I believe we can pretty well make evident our feeling insofar as the continuing of the Vietnam war; make evident this concern by concurring in this amendment and voting for this amendment. As I said before, it makes good sense and it is about time we turned over the fighting of this war to the Vietnamese.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I congrat-

ulate the gentleman and associate myself with his remarks.

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to restate the thrust of the amendments before us. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would eliminate the possibility of providing additional weapons and equipment for the South Vietnamese forces and thereby limit their effectiveness in battle. Most importantly the amendment would make it more difficult for the Vietnamese to assume a greater part of the role in Vietnam which they now are prepared to do and have shown the ability to do. This is something we have long desired.

The amendment to strike title I offered by the gentleman from New York would simply, in addition to eliminating weapons and equipment for the South Vietnamese and replenishment of our own depleted combat stocks, which is badly needed, would have a further very serious and undesirable effect. It also cut off the pay—listen to this—cut off the pay of the members of the armed services who are on duty in Southeast Asia. Regardless of intent, this would be the effect of the amendment.

Is that what we want to do?

We are being asked to show a vote of no confidence in the men who literally are fighting and dying for this country. This amendment truly would jerk the rug out from under them.

Just a little while ago we were being told that all the Communists wanted was to have us stop the bombing and they would be ready for realistic steps for peace. The bombing was stopped a year ago. What happened? Nothing. The Allied forces have been subjected to offensive after offensive, and the negotiations which have been in progress for months in Paris are still fruitless.

There still are requirements for the war in Vietnam which must be met. There is no way to avoid our own responsibilities.

That is why these amendments should be rejected, and they should be rejected overwhelmingly.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to the debate in favor of the amendment. I felt the arguments made were not even worthy of being debated. It is an extremely serious matter to challenge the provision of the weapons and supplies needed in Vietnam. We must support our troops there to the full extent of our ability and we must strengthen the troops of the Government of South Vietnam so that they can assume the major role in the defense of their country.

This is a supplemental appropriation. We are proposing to give the fighting

men the material they need to work with. The \$640 million recommended in Army procurement includes over \$393.7 million for our own men, \$338 million of which is for ammunition. Over \$246 million is to provide for going ahead with phase I and phase II of modernizing and equipping the Vietnamese so they can take over more of the war effort, and we can bring our boys home sooner.

This is what the \$640 million is for.

And we are replenishing the equipment destroyed in the Communist's Tet offensive of last year.

We are replenishing some funds we had to spend because the North Koreans became more aggressive in their actions, and seized the U.S.S. *Pueblo*.

I cannot understand why we should support amendments to abandon the responsibilities that we have supported with our wealth and with the lives of fine Americans. Therefore, I oppose the amendment to the amendment, and I oppose the amendment. I believe we should go ahead and make this appropriation for our military operations in Southeast Asia.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I am informed by the staff of the Appropriations Committee that there are unobligated funds in the Army procurement appropriations of \$3.9 billion. Would that not be adequate to cover the \$600 million sought to be stricken out by this amendment?

Mr. LIPSCOMB. At this point in time, the Army is operating under deficiencies in some appropriations. On May 5 of this year, the Deputy Secretary of Defense sent a letter to Congress notifying us that in military personnel and operations and maintenance they were operating in a deficiency condition. This is not true of the procurement account in which funds remain available until expended, but as the gentleman knows—he is a member of the Appropriations Committee—the funds which are unobligated are committed to specific programs and have been taken into account in arriving at the sum now recommended.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment to the amendment in order that it may be offered at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. HUNGATE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, I speak not critically either of President Johnson or of President Nixon, and perhaps at the same time critically of both of them. I believe they are using their best judgment in this situation. They are both in a better position, or should be, to know what is needed under the circumstances than are we. For this reason

I think the supplemental appropriations as requested should be supported.

I think it is regrettable that we in the Congress, as the elected Representatives of all the people, have no real control over the expenditures of lives in Vietnam. This is not a declared war; it is a conflict which has gone on for some years; so it cannot be said to be a temporary, emergency, expediency measure.

I am further concerned, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me I recall that a few years ago under the administration of President Johnson an announcement was made that draft calls would be drastically reduced. I think they were cut in half. It seems to me that announcement preceded an election by not very much. I know that my phone rang constantly at the same time, and almost every reservist throughout my district was called up—without the benefit of a press release.

I am concerned at this time, Mr. Chairman, because I hear rumors that 50,000 men may be coming home, and the July draft call may be drastically reduced. I have just been home. I was getting, at one point, three telephone calls an hour from men who might be drafted in June. The size of the May and June draft callups are not the subject of euphoric press releases.

This is a matter that concerns me. I hope we in the Congress can find some way better to control the expenditures of manpower in this country.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GIAIMO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Let us make it clear at the outset that I do not intend in any way to short-change our fighting men in Vietnam. During the many years that I have had the privilege of serving in this House, I have consistently supported the requests of the Department of Defense, but I think the time has come when we in the Congress must exercise our responsibility to see to it that the Department of Defense is brought to task and required to justify its expenditures. For too long a period of time, Defense officials have come before us in a high and mighty fashion saying in effect, "Unless you give us every dollar that we ask for, either in the regular Defense budget or, if we miss the mark, in our supplementals, you are not being loyal to your country and you are not being loyal to the proper defense of your country." I believe this is nonsense. I think the defense of the United States is the absolute first priority of all of us in this Nation, but that does not mean that I have to put a rubber stamp of approval on every appropriation request of the Department of Defense. If we study their actions in recent years, we will see that the mark has been missed many, many times. Again, I say that we in Congress must compel the Defense Department to stop the loose spending and in some instances the squandering of billions of the taxpayers' dollars.

Today we are talking about a request for \$1.2 billion. We are now being told

that if we do not appropriate this money we are jeopardizing our entire effort in Vietnam. Mind you, with a budget in the neighborhood of \$90 billion, the Defense Department is telling us that without this money it cannot afford to conduct operations in Southeast Asia. I believe that it can. I believe the Defense Department can tighten up. Most importantly of all, I think the success of this amendment will serve as notice to the Department of Defense that the Congress intends to exercise its rights and to perform its function by requiring that the taxpayers' money be accounted for properly.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIAIMO. I am delighted to yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman well knows that all of the funds requested by the Department of Defense last year were cut by more than \$5 billion. In the request which is before us, in the title we have up now, the Committee on Appropriations recommended, and the amount contained in the bill represents, a cut of \$262.9 million. In the entire bill there is a cut of \$559 million below the budget request for the military. So this is not by any means a rubber stamping of the requests that have been made. I thought in connection with the gentleman's statement that this fuller statement might be made.

Mr. GIAIMO. I understand, Mr. Chairman. While I realize that this is only the first step in the progress of this supplemental appropriation bill, I sincerely believe that the time has come for us to take a stand in the Congress to compel the DOD to be more responsive to the will of the American people and to the will of the Congress. In my opinion, the passage of this amendment is the only way in which this can be accomplished.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIKES) there were—ayes 25, noes 140.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army", \$640,100,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ECKHARDT

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ECKHARDT: On page 3, strike lines 1 through 5.

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered a moment ago but, technically, since it was offered to a motion to strike out all of the title, there was no amendment that was appropriate to be offered at that time. So, I withdrew it and I am reoffering it at this time.

Much of the debate and opposition to the first amendment went to the argument that we should support the men overseas, to which I agree, and I, therefore, voted against the first amendment. This is an amendment which in nowise jeopardizes the position of our men overseas. It merely calls a halt to the mad armaments spending in a war halfway around the globe, which constitutes most of title I of this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Members vote in support of the striking of the sum of \$640 million for procurement, which is prospective for the obtaining of further military materiel, to continue a war which we hope will close, and we should be doing everything we can to close it.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ECKHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago in an interchange with the gentleman from California (Mr. LIPSCOMB), I made the point that the staff of the Committee on Appropriations had informed me that there were unexpended funds in this item of \$3.9 billion. That point has been verified. There are unobligated and unexpended funds of that amount in this item.

It is true, I am told, that they have been programed, but the fact remains that they are not expended, nor are they obligated at the present time.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. If the gentleman will yield, there is a further point that the gentleman should make, and that is that they are committed funds.

Mr. ECKHARDT. There is nothing that we commit that we may not uncommit by this amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I suggest that there is a serious incongruity among those who, on the one hand, say that we have got to get out of Vietnam, and that we have got to turn more of this war over to the South Vietnamese and then proceed to support this amendment which would deny equipment to South Vietnam. They are biting off their noses to spite their faces, because this \$640 million when broken down shows \$393 million for U.S. forces in South Vietnam to replace the equipment that is being used up so very rapidly in the toughest war we have ever fought, and the other \$294 million would go to buy military equipment for the South Vietnamese forces. This amount, when broken down, shows \$80 million for ammunition, \$2.6 million for weapons, and other combat vehicles, \$9.7 million for tactical support vehicles, \$17.3 million for communication and electronic equipment, and \$53 million for other support equipment.

How in the world can you say on the one hand that you want the South Vietnamese to take a bigger share of fighting in this war—and I support that position, and so does the President, and so do most of the Members of the Congress—how can you say on the one hand that you want the South Vietnamese to take on a bigger responsibility in the prosecution of this war and then not give them equipment with which to wage the war?

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this amendment should be rejected by the overwhelming vote.

It would be my hope that the people of South Vietnam, their soldiers, and our own American soldiers who are fighting in South Vietnam in the cause of freedom, would receive renewed confidence and hope from the vote we just cast which rejected by this House overwhelmingly the previous amendment by a 6-to-1 vote, and that it would be an indication to them that we here in Congress support their struggle for freedom as we did when we overwhelmingly adopted the Tonkin Bay resolution, which put us into Vietnam in the first place.

If my memory is correct, I believe there was one dissenting vote in this Chamber, and that there were two or three dissenting votes in the other Chamber on the Tonkin Bay resolution.

Mr. Chairman, we have stood by the people of South Vietnam because we know this: the collapse of South Vietnam would only be the beginning of putting into captive bondage all the nations of Southeast Asia by the Soviet Union, just as the Communists put into Soviet bondage the captive nations of Europe and as the Soviets are now trying to put in Communist bondage and create captive nations out of all the nations in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, I am amazed at those who stand here today and say that they want us to get out of South Vietnam when they know that the Communists have 73 other countries on three continents earmarked for the same kind of brutal, barbaric, cruel aggression through subterfuge, and terror that they have tested for 5 years in Vietnam, and are continuing to use to this very date, if the forces of freedom should falter in South Vietnam.

I congratulate the committee for understanding the military needs of the people of South Vietnam and of the forces of South Vietnam, and if we really want the South Vietnamese to take on a bigger share of responsibilities, I suggest that you overwhelmingly reject this amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. From the figures given by the gentleman from Illinois and the figures given by the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Florida, it is perfectly obvious that if this amendment is approved as offered by the gentleman from Texas you will slow down and materially hinder and hamper the effort to give greater responsibility to the South Vietnamese.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Precisely.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Therefore, I hope that for the benefit of the American military forces in South Vietnam that the amendment is defeated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on this title do now close.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and on this title close in 5 minutes, and that the 5 minutes be given to the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations suggesting that I be given the 5 minutes, but I am sure we all recall that on the Tonkin Bay matter, we had all of 60 minutes and we spend less than 2 hours annually discussing these matters in Committee of the Whole. My point or inquiry, Mr. Chairman, is if you really think 5 minutes is adequate time to discuss the pending matter?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas please repeat his motion.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and on amendments to title I close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has noted the names of Members standing to be recognized under the limitation of time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON).

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, we have heard this old saw every time a supplemental appropriation comes before us, that but for these few billions of added dollars that was not anticipated—but for the approval of these few billions—all the American effort is going down the drain.

We have heard the old saw today that finally we are going to turn over the fighting to the South Vietnamese, if only we approve of this supplemental appropriation.

What absolute nonsense. The fact of the matter remains that we have uncommitted funds right now, if the Department of Defense wanted to use these funds, to arm or to train or to do whatever, with the South Vietnamese Army, and they could spend all the required money even if we do not do a darn thing but reject the pending proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment so that we can reduce our excessive military expenditures on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I feel like Alice must have in Wonderland. Or maybe Rip Van Winkle. We talk as if nothing goes on outside this room. We talk as if it were 5 years ago. We talk nonsense in circles—vicious circles.

Outside this room this country spirals into worsening crisis. We are impervious. We debate the longest war in our history, the most disputed adventure of our national experience, for half an hour. Thirty minutes. Then time is up. But if we cannot discuss these matters here, where can we? What is it we are so busy doing here?

Various Members have proclaimed today that we have an obligation to the Americans in Vietnam. That is one point we can all agree about: we have an obligation to the Americans in Vietnam. We have an obligation to the integrity of this Nation. That obligation is not met by abdicating the functions of the supreme legislative body of the greatest democracy on earth. It is not met by quartermaster-like issuing of ever more money to fight this pointless war which cannot be won and which is destroying national unity, poisoning the national purpose, crippling the national interest.

Does anyone still believe that voting supplemental funds to make possible supplemental Hamburger Hills will save American lives? Will increase the national security? Does anyone believe the Duke of Wellington is Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff? Can all us Alices leave Wonderland long enough to face the consequences of acting on this proposal by rote, by slogan, by habit, while all around us men and women in everless-quiet desperation and ever-larger numbers despair of the democratic process and despair for the sanity of the Nation. If we cannot stop long enough to debate, can we at least stop long enough to think?

Mr. Chairman, that is what this vote is all about.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I have participated in the very limited way that has been possible in this debate as it has recurred from time to time on the floor. I think every time I have had a chance to speak on this subject the time has been restricted to 1 or 2 minutes. I have been thoroughly unimpressed with the role of the committee in affording any direction other than to rubberstamp, essentially, the policies of the President. At some point the House of Representatives, if it is going to stand on its own feet and exercise its constitutional responsibilities, ought to face the policy questions involved here much more squarely than has happened in the past.

I do not believe that the Vietnam war has proven to be a wise venture. I take it from the actions and speeches of many of the Members here today that they think it has been a great venture for the American people. They support it. They are prepared to involve us in more Vietnams in neighboring countries in Southeast Asia. I deeply regret that we do not

have more time to discuss these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. An appropriation bill is indeed the only opportunity which we have to vote on the fundamental policy inherent in the Vietnam war. I would like to point out, with respect to the question of military personnel which was raised earlier, that the funds under title I are intended to cover and pay for increased deployment to Southeast Asia of some 17,400 Army personnel. According to the testimony of Gen. L. B. Taylor, director of Army budget, on page 361 of the hearings, and very significantly, in answer to a question posed by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) which was:

Do you have any plans to send any more there in the near future?

General Taylor said:

I think it goes up approximately [deletion] in the next fiscal year.

In other words, troop commitments in Vietnam will go up a certain number in the next fiscal year, according to General Taylor. Yet we do not have the benefit of knowing how many additional servicemen are scheduled for Southeast Asia because that has been deleted or censored by the Pentagon.

Mr. Chairman, I again urge the House to exercise its proper role and make it clear to the President that this war must be brought to a prompt conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

(Mr. ECKHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the lack of foresight that pervades the whole philosophy of those who would go pell-mell further into a war after they get to the level where the water is reaching their nostrils is illustrated by the argument here that we are going to arm and train the South Vietnamese Army under a supplemental appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN) and associate myself with their remarks. I think it is about time that we in the Congress reclaimed the prerogative of Congress to initiate and to declare war and to stop war when it becomes an insanity as is Vietnam. I think it is time that we issued our protest of the war in Vietnam in forceful terms. I think this is an opportunity for the Members of the House to make this protest heard.

Once again we are asked to acquiesce in approval of more funds for Vietnam. Contained in title I of the supplemental appropriations bill before us, this request is yet another testimonial to muddled political thinking and futile military efforts.

Again we shall hear the same chorus of voices telling us military victory is just around the corner. We know it is

not. Again we shall be assured that just a few more billion and a few more divisions are all that is needed for real power bargaining at the negotiating table. I refuse to believe it.

Once more we shall be told about viable patriotic democrats and heirs of Thomas Jefferson running the government in Saigon. We know they are a patchwork military junta whose jails are crammed with non-Communist opponents.

Still again we shall be told Ky and the Armed Forces of South Vietnam are almost ready to take over a more meaningful role in the war. I have seen too many dead Americans.

Taking all these factors into full consideration, I emerge with one major conclusion—that this war is a civil conflict where we can only continue to waste our substance in vain. Further, that we are only pouring good men and money down a bottomless drain.

I feel we have reached a point where the military of our own country must be curbed and held in tether. Also, their never-ending sources of national funds must be choked off, and there is no better time or place for it to begin than right here and now.

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. OTTINGER).

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, our colleague (Mr. PUCINSKI), related the fact of the overwhelming support of Congress for the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. Since that time a great many Americans and a great many Members of this Congress have felt that the policies then approved have proved to be bankrupt.

It is time that we reverse the inexorable increase in the amount we give to the military to prosecute the war and to ever expand it; it is time to stop pouring billions after billions of dollars down the bottomless pit of the military, especially when the military comes to us in this Congress and deliberately falsifies information and seeks to deceive us as it did in the case of the C-54 cargo plane. We simply can no longer take at face value that everything the military describes as "essential" is in fact essential.

We are now spending \$82.5 billion on the military. This constitutes some 60 percent of our free funds, not committed to payment of interest on the national debt. This is the largest and fastest rising item in the budget. Its rise must stop.

Many of us feel that the national security of our country is more threatened by internal explosion than by external invasion. A far greater proportion of our free funds must be devoted to education, job training, housing, and our environment if we are to survive. It is past time that we reverse the trend toward an ever larger war in Vietnam and an ever larger military commitment, all made perversely in the name of "peace."

This increase is a good place to start.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILBERT).

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the Ryan amendment to eliminate title I of the supplemental appropriations bill. I felt a vote for tile I is a vote to continue the unpopular war in Vietnam. My support of the Ryan amendment is meant to indicate the dissent in my district and in the country. People are opposed to the Vietnam war, and we in Congress must make every effort to appeal to the President to take steps to end the war. Our best way in Congress to support our troops, is to withdraw them, as I proposed just a few days ago in a resolution introduced in Congress with several of my colleagues. In supporting the Ryan amendment, I have attempted to register my protest, and that of my constituency, over any action to prolong fighting in Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would think Members of this House would have learned something from the events of the past year and a half: That the intensity of the fighting in Vietnam does not bring peace closer, but that restraint does.

We would not even be negotiating as we are today in Paris if President Johnson had not shown restraint by stopping the bombing of North Vietnam. Support of this amendment would indicate support of the idea of restraint in the future by keeping down the violence and would bring peace closer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, we are in Vietnam because of the overwhelming vote in the House and in the Senate in support of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution which put us there. America went there with its eyes open. Congress knew what the consequences would be and that it would be a tough war. Just because it has been a difficult war, they should not be coming in here whimpering to pull out.

The President was right when he said if the needless suffering continues at the hands of the North Vietnamese, we will have to reconsider our alternatives. I think there is a very good chance we may have to resume the bombing of the North. The last year during which we have had the pause in the bombing has only brought more casualties of American boys and no subsequent progress toward peace.

I believe we may very well have to resume the bombing of the North and at the same time withdraw our troops from Vietnam so that North Vietnam will realize it is in for a long bombing siege. Only then may we see some progress in Paris.

This money and equipment is needed to win the war. This war is not going to be won in this Chamber; it will be won by the fighting in Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, it is not because this is a tough war or a hard war that I oppose it but because it is an immoral war, which is to say our involvement is politically, militarily, and economically indefensible. We therefore ought to get out of Vietnam.

The vote on this supplemental war appropriation is symbolic. If we were to vote it down, the President would know that we want a cease-fire now and a start of the withdrawal of American troops now.

This vote transcends the simple question of an appropriation; it is rather an opportunity for those who oppose the war to demonstrate their opposition.

We are told that we must vote for this appropriation in order to support our soldiers in Vietnam. I support our men in Vietnam. I want to bring them home.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN).

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, 5 years ago I remember the then Secretary of Defense and the military saying the war would be over in a couple of months. This is a broken record of constant reiteration and the war still goes on.

I think the only way we can effectively turn this war over to the South Vietnamese is by denying any further funds for procurement of materiel. There is sufficient funds in the pipeline for materiel so the Vietnamese can take over the war.

I believe this additional equipment is unnecessary to provide full protection to our present forces in Vietnam. It could only serve as a means of escalating the American presence in Vietnam and discouraging the South Vietnamese from taking over a greater degree of responsibility for the prosecution of the war.

I believe that the passage of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to delete this \$640,100,000 would take us a significant step closer to the goal of getting out of Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader (Mr. GERALD R. FORD).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the amendment as drafted is sloppy and poorly put together. The net result, however, is that we are faced with whether or not we will go along with the desire of the American people to transfer to our allies, the South Vietnamese, a greater and greater share and ultimately the total burden of the fighting in Vietnam.

If we vote for this amendment, we are voting to set back and to roadblock the effort to give the South Vietnamese a greater share of the fighting. Therefore, I truly hope that the amendment, badly drafted as it is, is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LIPSCOMB).

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, the Nixon administration and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations have examined the requests for funds for military operations in Southeast Asia and has reduced them where not essential. The Subcommittee on Defense went very deeply into the requests and reduced

over \$262 million in the revised request for procurement funds.

The amount requested in the procurement account are the very minimum needed to support not only our own effort in Vietnam, but to equip and modernize the South Vietnamese.

I ask a no vote on the amendment.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must inform the gentlewoman from New York that under the time limitation she is not eligible for recognition.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. May I ask another Member to yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentlewoman may ask another Member to yield.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM).

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I have just one brief statement to make, because I think most of the statements pertaining to the reasons why we should withdraw from this war in Vietnam have been made.

I speak on behalf of a minority in this country, the women and the mothers, the mothers whose sons have been lost in this war. Unfortunately, here in this body we do not have enough women to speak out on behalf of the women of this country who have been suffering as a result of the loss of their sons in this war.

I think there has to come a time when we have to recognize that we must withdraw, that we cannot continue to lose the cream of the crop of the young men in this country in a war that is unjust, a war that is highly immoral.

The mandate of the people of this country has not been paid any attention. We are supposed to be representing the people of the United States in this Chamber, and the mandate means absolutely nothing in terms of what the women of this country are speaking out about.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BURTON of California) there were—ayes 23, noes 134.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND
CONSERVATION SERVICE
SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Sugar Act program", \$7,500,000.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to ask the chairman whether the amount listed on lines 11 and 12 of page 3—"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', for 'Plant and animal disease and pest control,' includes any amount that involves the spreading of pesticides such as DDT and other non-degradable pesticides, or whether this refers only to the sterile fly program for elimination of the screw-worm referred to in the report."

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman direct his question to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture?

Mr. OTTINGER. I am glad to.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is limited to the sterilization of flies and the effort to stop the screw-worm infestation. Most of it represents money already expended under authority which permits deficit spending where life and property would otherwise be endangered.

Norie of it has the purpose in mind that the gentleman refers to.

Mr. OTTINGER. In that case I have no objection. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia", for the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$10,365,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask someone on the Committee on Appropriations whether there are funds in this bill for the restoration of buildings that have been gutted by arson and fire and other acts of property damage at Howard University, including the destruction of a \$30,000 fire truck.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NATCHER. I would like for the gentleman to know that in this bill we have no money whatsoever for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

MORTGAGE CREDIT

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat. 477), is increased by \$40,000,000 and the limitation on total payments under those entered into under section 236 of such Act (82 Stat. 498) is increased by \$40,000,000.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. FRASER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate my support for the provision in H.R. 11400 which provides \$40 million in new contract authority for the section 235 homeownership program. I would like to have seen the Appropriations Committee approve the administration's full request of \$50 million for section 235 but the money in this bill will at least

enable the program to continue operating. It is essential that we follow up action on this \$40 million supplemental appropriation with approval later in the session of the full 1970 budget of \$100 million for section 235.

The section 235 program has only been in operation in my district since the first of the year but already it is beginning to have a significant impact. In January the Minneapolis FHA office was allocated mortgage subsidy funds for 100 homes. Within 3 months all these funds had been obligated and the office now has a waiting list of over 200 eligible families.

The Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Authority has found that section 235 is a particularly useful aid for moderate income families displaced by the urban renewal projects. A MHRA staff member wrote to tell me that three families relocated from a north Minneapolis renewal project had recently obtained FHA mortgages subsidized under 235:

They bought good houses—houses they could not have purchased without the subsidy. Home ownership will not be a burden because payments are related to their ability to pay. But for every home purchased, we had at least 8 inquiries. Many families are continuing to look for homes pending appropriations of more funds.

The following cases from the Housing Authority files provide interesting examples of how section 235 can make a real difference for families in need of good housing:

FAMILY "C"

Mr. and Mrs. "C" have two children, ages 3 and 2. The "Cs" purchased a FHA repossessed home in northeast Minneapolis. The home is a two story frame structure with four bedrooms, bath and kitchen, living room and dining room. It was built about 50 years ago and has been well maintained.

FHA approved a mortgage with a local savings and loan association on February 27, 1969. It was set at 7½% for \$17,300 with a \$200 down payment under Section 235. The "Cs" moved into their new home on April 1. Their share of the monthly payments is \$86.71 with a Section 235 subsidy of \$72.57 for a total of \$159.28 per month.

FAMILY "H"

Mr. and Mrs. "H" have three children, ages 10, 8 and 7. They are expecting their fourth child in August. The "Hs" bought a two-story home built in the early 1900s. A special attraction of this home is its location next to a school, so their daughter with cerebral palsy doesn't have to walk.

The "Hs" purchased their home for \$14,800. The total monthly mortgage payment is \$133.51. The "Hs" will pay \$82.15 and the government will subsidize \$51.36. The payment of \$82.15 is 20% of Mr. "Hs" adjusted monthly income. The reasonable amount of the "Hs" monthly payments should enable them to stay financially secure and build an equity from this purchase.

The human element in this new program is conveyed very effectively by a constituent who recently wrote:

I had been paying \$113.00 per month and I was only earning about \$300.00 per month for almost 10 years. With paying this much per month, I could hardly make any repairs. Things had reached the point where it was raining in every bedroom. When my children needed more and I could not keep up the payments, I was given 30 days to move out. This was the point where 235 came to my rescue.

Now with my small house, easy upkeep and the monthly payments are much less, I feel more confident in the future. I hope this greatly needed program may be expanded. I know from experience how terrible it is not to have a decent place to come home from work. When I see friends and neighbors under the conditions I was in, I feel I should try to let you know how much this can mean to people and how more should be done.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of the 1968 Housing Act held out the hope of homeownership for millions of low-income families. Now, a year later, when the initial excitement over this historic legislation has died down, it is up to us to make sure that the new housing programs really work. Unless we vote adequate funds for section 235 and the other innovative programs, the 1968 act will be nothing more than a token attempt to meet our country's critical housing needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, not to exceed a total of \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 13, strike out all of lines 13 through 20; and on page 14, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that this is a big bill. This is a \$4 billion supplemental appropriation bill making additions to the regular appropriation bills of last year. And, I want to underscore what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) said earlier. He said, in effect, that these supplemental appropriation bills are coming too fast. They make meaningless the validity of the regular appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out the \$3 million for the Arts and Humanities Foundation. I would like to ask the proponents for handing over another \$3 million to this Arts and Humanities Foundation if they have read the latest casualty figures for Vietnam war, if they have, whether they do not think it is more than slightly tragic to be spending this money for poetry reading and ballet dancing when we are in the midst of a horribly costly full-scale war in men and money. We have lost 35,000 men killed in action in Vietnam, nearly another 6,000 dead from various other causes in connection with this war and 225,000 wounded. These arts and humanities people seem to be concerned mostly with bailing out bankrupt cultural centers, such as the one in Atlanta, Ga., while the Federal debt climbs and inflation gallops on.

I remind you of the testimony of Charles Mark, the planning and analysis director of this organization. He wants this money so they can transport actors from Louisville, Atlanta, Cincinnati, and Minneapolis—among other places—to Broadway at the expense of the taxpayers. When they get there, Mr. Mark said, they will dance dances, present chamber opera, whatever that is, and give poetry readings.

Mr. Mark failed to give any testimony on the subject of where the public's money has already gone at the hands of this Arts and Humanities setup.

It would be interesting to know, too, if they plan any more grants to study Apache Indian history, or to make a computer analysis of style problems in epic poetry; or for research for a book on medieval comic opera.

Are they going to shell out more money for a study of aspects of Wordsworth's reading and writing "which have gone unnoticed or misinterpreted"?

Perhaps they have another grant in mind to study the background of 17th century members of Parliament.

Maybe they plan another grant or two for a study of the leading literary critics of the 19th century Spanish literature.

These people have never, as far as I can determine, financed a study of the flight of our gold to foreign countries, nor has there been a grant to find out what tune Nero was playing when Rome burned. Maybe we could use that tune today as a sort of a second national anthem, when we talk in terms of giving an additional \$3 million to people who engage in spending the taxpayers' money for purposes of this kind. Here is \$3 million we could save, and we had better start saving the millions or we are never going to save the billions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes. It is not necessary, I believe, because my beloved friend from Iowa has not caught up yet with the question that he asked 3 years ago when, of all things, being from an agricultural State, he said that he did not know the difference between a bale of hay and a ballet dancer. That is rather remarkable, being from that area. One might expect that someone from Manhattan or places like that would not know that difference, at least, they would not know a bale of hay.

Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that this is really a startlingly small amount of money, even though it is what was requested for matching grants. The gentleman from Iowa and some of the members of the committee might find it perfectly easy to deride such things as interpretation of poetry and 19th-century Spanish literature, or anything else that makes life beautiful.

Mr. Chairman, to equate this amount of money with what happens in Vietnam is, I believe, ridiculous. Probably this

amount of money would not even pump the water out of that submarine at Mare Island.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, it might help.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It might help. It would cost, probably, much more than \$3 million to pump it out, that is true.

Mr. GROSS. I did not know in New Jersey that \$3 million could be spent on notice, but perhaps that is true.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That what?

Mr. GROSS. That \$3 million could be spent on notice, that it had any real meaning.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. This has very real meaning, I will say to my friend from Iowa. This covers the entire governmental operation with respect to those grants to the arts and the humanities, to scholarship, and to the beautiful things in life.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey. This appropriation item gives us the opportunity to get private contributions into this very important area. On another point, while the gentleman has called attention to some areas, that might be humerous to some of us, is certainly none of us would, I hope, undertake to hamstring the artists and humanists of this country by trying to circumscribe the areas in which they operate. This program has been well run. I have had an opportunity to examine its scope and operations, and I commend the great men who have administered it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I quite agree with the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to quote a project that took place just recently in Rhode Island. It was a very healthy and excellent demonstration. As a result of funding from the arts and humanities in Rhode Island, we had a project called Discovery which visited the high schools of the entire State—the theater.

The children who were benefited by this program were very disappointed when they found out that Project Discovery might very well not be continued this year because of lack of funding.

So they put on a demonstration march to the State House hoping that the State would help to fund and that private funds would come in so that they could continue Project Discovery.

I feel that if this type of demonstration can be generated from this funding, certainly it is a healthy thing for the future of our Nation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman has pointed out something that is very valuable, as has the majority leader.

The fact is that since the passage of this legislation nearly every State in the Union has formed its own State arts council and has turned the attention of the youngsters and of the populace of the States to the beautiful things in life. They may not have much value to some of us, but they do to me and they do to the children and they do to elderly people, such as my friend, Dr. Barnaby Keeney.

This money will generate probably three times as much as the appropriation provided for here. The Endowments on the Arts and the Humanities have done a truly magnificent job with very meager resources.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the gentleman correctly, the possibility may be that some of our colleagues cannot distinguish a ballet dancer from a bale of hay, and I believe that this would justify a considerable expenditure for cultural enrichment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I suppose it would.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to the subcommittee and to the committee and my gratitude and the gratitude of our great constituencies who are interested in the arts and humanities for their work and for this very modest contribution.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the \$3 million placed in this bill is to provide for matching grants for every dollar that the Government spends here, another dollar or more of grants will be donated and used to further the program arts and humanities.

After listening to the debate a little earlier on another subject, I am just going to repeat what I said last year.

We have solved many technical problems. We have made magnificent contributions in the sciences and, yet, not yet does this Nation understand the depth of its soul. A better understanding of ourselves can be the contribution of the humanities.

To the gentleman from Iowa, may I ask, what is wrong with knowing the history—the proud history of the Apache Nation?

Mr. Chairman, I want to read a statement by a rather well-known business enterprise. A page advertisement was taken in the newspapers of the West about 3 weeks ago by the Pacific Northwest Bell.

At the top of the page appear the words "The Big Change in Arts and Culture." At the bottom it says:

Like many others in the business world today we recognize that the opportunity to enjoy the arts is an important part of the quality of living we enjoy here in the Pacific Northwest. And like any part of our environment, their growth must be nurtured and stimulated. You might say that's been our theme in this Big Change series. For what we've been saying is that the assets we have

in Washington must be matched by the deeds of men if we are all to enjoy the productive life. And that's an unchanging assignment.

I strongly urge you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. How about the history of the Comanches, and the Arapahos and all the rest of them—the Mohawks, the Sioux, the Cherokees, and all other Indian tribes?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. If the gentleman will yield, I think the history of every group who has been part of this country's history is part and parcel of this country's great heritage and should be more widely known. It is part of our culture.

I am personally proud to have worked with the Indian people of this Nation and to understand their role and their relationship in today's world.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman in the very brief hearings that we held on this subject said it was her understanding that the appropriations—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Washington has expired.

(Mr. McDADE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to point out to the Members on both sides of the aisle that this is a recommendation that comes from the subcommittee in unanimous fashion. We gave it what we thought was an important and extensive hearing. In our judgment, it is an item in which our Government, our Nation, our people, ought to be interested.

The question is really at what level. I believe all of us will agree that this is a minimal level of Federal funding. I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the position of the subcommittee and defeat the amendment offered by my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Did not the gentlewoman from Washington, in opening the quick hearing on this \$3 million item, say that, in effect, she was surprised that they would be asking for this funding since she thought supplemental appropriations dealt with emergencies? What kind of emergency is there in this situation?

Mr. McDADE. I would say to my colleague—and the gentlewoman from Washington, of course, is able to speak for herself ably—but I would point out that this is a matching program in which we are making an effort to stimulate non-Federal funding in this area, and in order to do this we are providing funds which can be matched in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. But that scarcely makes an emergency out of this thing.

Mr. McDADE. I think we have to do it in order to stimulate the non-Federal funding. We ought at least to come forward with some Federal funding to keep faith. That is what we are doing.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. May I say that in our committee questions were asked to develop the fullest amount of information necessary to find out what the funds were designed to do. We were told that for every dollar that would be provided in the Federal funding there is more than a dollar pledged in gifts to the arts and humanities under the matching program. We did not want to appropriate more than would be necessary. We did want to know why, exactly, we needed the money at this time, and the complete answers are in the record of our hearings.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I think that when the history books of our Nation are written, we are going to be judged not on the number of angry bombs we were able to produce, or the screaming missiles, or the whining bullets, but by what kind of culture or civilization we created.

The gentleman from Iowa mentioned Vietnam. I believe the people of this country want to acknowledge that there are more things to life than wars, and that there are the pursuits of peace, and the advantages and the blessing of peace. We would like to acknowledge that we are a humane, an interested, and an aware people.

I do not think a Congress that today is appropriating \$1.2 billion for killing has the right to turn its back on a token \$3 million for the appreciation of culture and the blessings of democracy and learning. This may seem a very paltry matter, but I think it goes to the heart of what America is and what America would like to be and what America could become if we are willing to invest our wealth in our minds and our spirits. We must not become a nation of Philistines. We are not barbarians; we are human beings.

As one who would have chosen over Sparta, I urge the rejection of this negative amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. MAYNE).

(Mr. MAYNE asked and was given

permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would not want to take the position that \$3 million is a small amount of money, but considering the vast scope of this project, the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, this seems to me to be a very reasonable expenditure in this bill. I, therefore, speak in opposition to the amendment.

Cultural activities of this kind have never in the history of civilization operated at a profit. It has always been necessary to have either some Government subsidization or some other type of contribution from patrons or sponsors to bring great works of art and literature to the peoples of the world. This has been necessary to make progress in raising the cultural and artistic standards of the human race.

We are not talking here about some vague experimental program, but of a program which has already proved its worth operating within the confines of a relatively modest budget.

As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) said, the arts councils have been very successful throughout the United States. I can certainly assure my colleagues that the Iowa Arts Council, under the direction of Jack E. Olds, has been an outstanding success. This has been a bipartisan effort in the State of Iowa commenced during the administration of a Democratic Governor with an appropriation of \$50,000. This year a Republican Governor has recommended an appropriation of \$61,460 and the full amount has been voted by a Republican legislature. Using State and Federal funds, the Iowa Arts Council has been able to bring great music, great literature, and great drama to every corner of the State. The 1967-68 biennium report of the council shows that 33 projects were undertaken and presented in a great majority of Iowa's 99 counties.

To mention some of these, there were performances by the Des Moines Civic Ballet at Marshalltown and Des Moines and a performance by the Dubuque City Youth Ballet Company in collaboration with the University of Northern Iowa.

An extended tour by the University of Northern Iowa Concert Chorale and Concert Band; a tour of western counties by the Iowa State Symphonic Band; recitals by the internationally known Iowa violinist, Charles Treger, the only American to win the famous Wieniawski competition in Poznan, Poland, and by Pianist David Kaiserman.

A tour of 24 communities by poets from Iowa colleges and universities who read and interpreted their poems to an estimated 5,000 high school students; a drama consultation and technical services project from Iowa State University which brought staff members as consultants to about six communities.

An artist-in-residence program which brought the celebrated painter, Marion J. Kitzman, of Iowa State University, to two communities; a touring exhibition of prints by 12 Iowa printmakers; a traveling program showing and discussing films as an art form was presented in four communities.

An Iowa designer-craftsmen touring exhibit assembled by Donn Young, director of the Cedar Rapids Art Center, which has toured 22 communities.

These are some of the extremely worthwhile programs which the Iowa Arts Council has been carrying forward with the aid of grants from the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, and from the Iowa State Legislature. Even more extensive and rewarding programs for the people of Iowa are being planned for next year, if sufficient funds such as those provided for in this bill can be made available through the Arts and Humanities Foundation. The Iowa Legislature has already done its share having appropriated the full amount of \$61,460 recommended by Governor Ray for the 1969-70 biennium. I strongly urge that this House similarly show its confidence in the worthiness of the program, by overwhelmingly rejecting this amendment, the purpose of which is to delete all supplemental funds for the Arts and Humanities Foundation.

Evidently some Members of the House are still unaware of the vigorous cultural and artistic activity which has long thrived in the State of Iowa. There has even been some intimation that one of the most beautiful of the performing arts, the ballet, is completely unknown in Iowa. Nothing could be further from the truth. In addition to fairly frequent appearances by national touring companies, a number of Iowa colleges, universities, and cities sustain their own ballet groups. I can assure the House that many Iowans know what ballet dancers look like. Thanks to the Iowa Arts Council and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, increasing numbers of Iowans are having an opportunity to decide for themselves whether their lives are indeed enriched by the humanities and the arts. I urge all my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment has said we should start with a half million dollars or with \$3 million before we can expect to save billions of dollars. The House has just rejected an opportunity to register a protest against the literally billions of dollars in waste which has been exposed in the Defense Department. Therefore, I would suggest a slogan for this amendment: "Billions for defense waste, but not one cent for what we are supposed to be defending."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Gross).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 21, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,
AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher educational activities", including payments authorized by section 108(b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as amended

(Public Law 90-354, approved June 20, 1968), and annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), \$11,161,000, of which \$3,920,000 shall remain available until expended for said annual interest grants: *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHERLE

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHERLE: On page 15, at the end of line 6, strike the period and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by P.L. 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act."

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am proposing would prohibit any part of the funds appropriated by H.R. 11400—under chapter VII, higher education activities found on page 14 of this supplemental appropriation bill—for the purpose of such annual interest grants to be granted to any institution which is not in full compliance with the provisions of section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968.

Under chapter VII of the bill before us, Congress is asked to appropriate \$3.9 million for interest subsidy grants for college construction loans. This Federal financial assistance would result in the colleges being able to obtain an estimated \$145 million in loans from non-Federal sources.

The taxpayers have a large stock in the higher educational institutions in this country—billions of their tax dollars aid it each year. There is an urgent need for college administrators to eliminate the radical troublemakers. The clear congressional intent is that the colleges either ought to clean up their campuses or suffer the consequences.

I can think of no more powerful way to impress upon the administrators the seriousness of their failure to impose section 504 than to tell them that such failure would mean that they will not be eligible for this additional type of aid.

Section 504—Public Law 90-575—basically requires that if any student is found, after a hearing by the college or university, to have either have been convicted of a crime in a court of record or violated a school regulation which was of a serious nature and contributed to a disruption which prevented his faculty or other students from attending to their duties or engaging in studies, then that student shall not be eligible for certain Federal student loan programs for at least 2 years.

Some colleges are laboring under the false impression given by former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, who felt that enforcement of section 504 was not mandatory. However, the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, in testimony before a House Subcommittee on Special Education, of

which I am a member, on April 18, 1969, made it clear that section 504 imposed a mandatory obligation on the college. Secretary Finch said:

As with any provision of law, Section 504 demands compliance in good faith by those to whom it applies. So we expect that colleges and universities will strive in good faith to implement its provisions for aid termination where the facts disclose the "abuses" have taken place.

The amendment only requires the institution of higher education which wishes to qualify for funds under the annual interest grant program to obey the law as far as section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 is concerned. Surely no institution of higher education can make any claim that it should be "beyond the law" in any respect, or that it should not have to comply with the provisions of section 504. It is in fact "bad faith" on the part of an institution of higher education if it applies for one form of Federal assistance while it is guilty of refusal or failure to comply with the requirements of the law in its administration of another Federal assistance program.

The intent of Congress that the colleges must hold hearings is most clear. Not only was it clear from the language used in section 504, but in addition the Congress last year passed substantially similar amendments to three different appropriations bills. They were the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Act for fiscal 1969, Independent Offices Appropriation Act—Public Law 90-550—and NASA appropriation—Public Law 90-373.

This amendment does not bring the Federal Government into the field of academic discipline. It merely states that none of the funds under this section will be granted to any institution that is unwilling to comply with the present Federal law.

The amendment is important not so much in the program that it amends, but in the principle that it establishes. The relatively new and small annual interest grants program is the only rather general assistance program relating to institutions of higher education in the present bill. My amendment will help the annual interest grant program, by insuring that the limited funds will go to those institutions which are willing to help themselves and to curb the violence and disorders disrupting and in many ways destroying these institutions by using all appropriate means available, including the tools made available to these institutions by section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. Denial of an annual interest grant will not invoke serious injury upon any institution, but it would show the institutions that Congress is concerned and demands compliance with section 504 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. The experience gained under this amendment would be of great interest when the Congress considers Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations legislation for fiscal year 1970 later this year, and when it considers other legislation in the field of Federal assistance to higher education.

In brief, my amendment simply says that section 504 of the present law must be enforced, not ignored; that the time to stop disorder on the campuses of our Nation is now, not later; and that the American people are fed up with placid college administrators who are unwilling or unable to carry out their responsibilities to their colleges, their communities, or their country.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, he is drawing attention to section 504 of the Higher Education Act and to sections of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, the independent offices appropriation bill, and the Defense appropriation bill of last year which contain certain restrictive language with regard to aid to the colleges. To some extent, the gentleman's amendment merely seems to endorse the present law. I have no authority to speak for the Committee on Appropriations, but personally I do not see anything objectionable about the amendment.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be closed in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL).

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, it disquiets me to see an effort afoot in the House to coerce universities and colleges into taking action against student protestors. Offered in the form of an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill we are considering, it aims at a Federal intrusion onto almost every campus in the Nation, deciding who shall be penalized, and who shall not be.

Such an amendment requiring institutions of higher learning applying for Federal interest subsidies for construction projects to certify that they are complying with a legislative antidisorder measure passed by Congress last year. Here we have those who cry the loudest about Federal intervention, demanding such intervention in the worst possible manner.

Such an overshadowing Federal presence and the threat implied is the very antithesis of what Congress intentions were when Federal aid to colleges and universities was enacted into law. Shall the National Government use its freely offered aid to education to require each school to retain or expel students? Is the Government about to set up standards for scholarship as well?

Enactment of such a coercive measure would be the first step toward abrogation of all the liberties our campuses embody and teach. Academic freedom and the right to dissent will be next. This is intrusion with a vengeance.

I hold no brief for those who bring weapons onto campuses or destroy prop-

erty. I have no sympathy with those who use the right of protest to prevent the vast majority from attending classes and obtaining educations.

Simultaneously, Mr. Chairman, I am vehemently opposed to those who have so little faith in our young people, our ideals and our institutions. At the first sign of trouble, their answer is coercion, abrogation of traditional liberties and the imposition of harsh laws and harsher penalties. Already overreaction is visible in the form of midnight arrests and pounding on the door in the wee hours. This is no solution. It is the very antithesis of our country. We must not allow ourselves to be carried away by the frightened cries of those with little faith and no understanding of democracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, the potential effect of this amendment is most abhorrent. It would substitute the judgment of the Secretary of HEW for that of the chancellor of every university with respect to student discipline. And cruelly, if such oversight were exercised so as to find the university chancellor derelict, then under this amendment the Federal funds granted to the university for the construction of academic facilities would be withdrawn affecting all students, good and bad alike, violent and nonviolent.

Those who have always feared the assertion of Federal power in education now seem bent on using it in a punitive manner. Students must be held responsible for their conduct—but the Federal Government has no business using its funds to play schoolmaster.

This amendment establishes an ugly precedent and I oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

(Mr. HARSHA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The American people are fed up with the violence, destruction of property, intimidations, and disruptions on the college campuses. They are sick and tired of seeing their tax dollars used for purposes for which they were never intended. They are sick and tired of seeing educational facilities which they funded abused and misused for purposes for which they were never intended.

This amendment merely serves notice on the faculties and administrators that they must enforce the law on their campuses and they must put their own house in order so that academic freedom can be maintained in these institutions, so that the great majority of students who earnestly desire an education may pursue their efforts to improve their knowledge and skills in an atmosphere conducive to that goal.

This amendment is not repressive. It does not impose Federal intervention on the universities, but to the contrary will

help insure academic freedom. It should serve notice, however, to the faculties and administrators that unless they do put their own house in order and bring a halt to this nonsense, that they themselves have encouraged, that the American people will no longer stand for such actions and that this Congress will undoubtedly take far sterner measures in the event that they continue to fail to meet their responsibilities.

This is a most proper amendment and is a proper area in which this Congress can act. Certainly there is a Federal interest involved here because of the great expenditure of Federal funds in the name of higher education, and the Congress has a responsibility to see that these funds are properly used and that the facilities constructed with these funds are not destroyed or damaged.

I have been approached from several sources inquiring whether or not I would offer my bill as an amendment to this legislation, and I was also asked, in the event I did not offer my bill, if someone else offered it, would I support it as an amendment to this supplemental appropriations bill.

I informed those who made such inquiries that I would not offer my bill nor support anyone else who did in that event. While I feel very strongly on this issue, it is my feeling that the Special Subcommittee on Campus Disorders under the chairmanship of the distinguished lady from Oregon has acted very equitably and fairly in this matter.

They are conducting hearings on the issue and have been doing so for several weeks. They have afforded me an opportunity to express my views on behalf of my legislation and afforded others a similar opportunity. It is my feeling that we first should exhaust the usual legislative process before we resort to any other methods to legislate on this issue.

Therefore, I have indicated that I would not offer my legislation at this time.

I think the proper procedure is to let the committee work its will and to inquire into all the ramifications of this issue. I am convinced the committee is doing that and will come up with some suggested legislation to cope with this issue of such concern to the American people. In the event it does not, there will be ample time and opportunity to offer my legislation or other measures to cope with the situation.

I see nothing contradictory with that approach in supporting this amendment as the amendment merely clarifies existing law and tells the faculties and administrators that before they receive any future funds they must certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that they will comply with existing law. This is little enough to ask of these faculties and administrators, and I would hope that the committee would accept this amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. MICHEL addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine (Mr. HATHAWAY).

(Mr. HATHAWAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. As I understand, the gentleman proposes that institutions of higher education certify that they are in compliance with section 504 of the Higher Education Act and section 411 of the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act as a prerequisite to making application for programs which will be funded under the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969. As a practical matter, this will mean that institutions will be required to make this certification with respect to just one program—the program providing Federal payments to reduce interest charges on loans obtained from the private money market for the construction of academic facilities.

Mr. Chairman, the bases for my opposition to this amendment are numerous. First of all, the amendment will be most selective in its application. Under the \$3.9 million supplemental appropriation proposed for the interest subsidy program, it is estimated that less than 250 institutions of higher education, out of a possible 2,000, will be able to participate in the program. Thus, under the amendment only a small percentage of our Nation's colleges and universities will be obligated to meet the requirement mandated by the gentleman's amendment. All other institutions, many of them carrying on extensive student assistance programs, will not be required under the gentlemen's amendment to file a certification of compliance.

Mr. Chairman, more objectionable than this, however, is the very dangerous precedent which this amendment would establish: Action taken last year in the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 and on the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill was directed at disruptive students. These amendments were not directed at institutions of higher education as is the gentleman's amendment. We must not confuse our purposes for it is a much different matter to suggest that we punish colleges and universities than it is to say that we should punish students for illegal actions.

As you know, the Subcommittee on Special Education has conducted extensive hearings on the question of student unrest and, not one witness, and I include Secretary Finch and Attorney General Mitchel, has suggested that we enact legislation directed at institutions of higher education. Quite the contrary is the case. Just yesterday, Attorney General Mitchel advised us that he did not recommend any additional Federal legislation at this time. What he was saying to us is what should be repeated here today—that there is sufficient existing authority to meet the problem.

There is clearly sufficient authority to deal with any institution of higher education which refuses to comply with sec-

tions 411 and 504. There is absolutely no need to add the requirement the gentleman's amendment suggests. It can only be viewed as a totally unnecessary amendment which would be selective in its application and which would establish a most dangerous precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. EVANS).

(Mr. EVANS of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. If the proponent of the amendment would answer a question, I would like to pose an inquiry. If his amendment passes, how and by whom is it going to be determined as to whether a college or university is in compliance with the laws as passed last year?

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHERLE. Under section 504, if they comply with the law as I indicated, there would be no problem whatsoever.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. My question is how and by whom is it determined that they are complying with the laws which have been previously passed?

Mr. SCHERLE. We leave the determination in the hands of the college administrators, exactly where it belongs, and they will have to make the determination as to whether they are in compliance with the statutes.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. When the gentleman mentions "compliance with the statutes," who will judge as to whether or not they are in compliance with such statutes under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. SCHERLE. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will have final jurisdiction in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

(Mr. SCHERLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, the statement was made a moment ago that this is punitive with reference to the penalty involved. Certainly there should be a penalty. I think it is very important that the penalty be available for use. This is exactly what it would amount to: It would leave the authorization in the colleges and universities where it belongs and all we say is, "You enforce the law." We take no jurisdiction away from them. The discretion lies in the areas of the college and university and all we are asking is that they enforce the law.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. If it remains in the hands of the office of education it would be handed over to the commissioner of education?

Mr. SCHERLE. It will rest in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. In other words, he will have jurisdiction over every college and university which receives Federal funds?

Mr. SCHERLE. No, the decision to comply with section 504 would remain with the college and university administrators. If they do not comply with the law then funds would be cut off.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN).

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It was my privilege to draft and introduce those portions of section 504 that do not relate to conviction. There is no reason why we should not now require compliance with statutes that were passed by this Congress by a vote of 6 to 1. The only action required on the part of the schools is either that someone should be convicted or that, after notice and hearing, they have been found by the school to have wilfully participated in a serious disruption of the university administration. This amendment would leave the control of the situation in the school administration where it belongs, except in cases of convictions in court, which, incidentally, I hope will be extended to include convictions for contempt of court at some later date.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is a worthy one in coping with some aspects of the problems which we are now experiencing at our educational institutions. This is not the complete legislative response, but it helps. In due course hopefully the subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) will present additional general legislation firmly imposing sanctions and appropriate penalties for the reprehensible deliberate insurrection we have been witnessing with dismay on too many campuses in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN).

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, section 504 was adopted by this Congress last year by an overwhelming majority. As I understand the amendment this does not cut off funds. It requires each university which wants to apply for funds to file a certificate of compliance—simply a statement to the effect that they will comply with the law.

I do not believe there is anything repressive about this; I do not believe it is punitive, but it serves notice upon the colleges and universities of this country that the Congress of the United States has a legitimate concern about the violence which is now current on our college campuses.

This Congress is concerned when advance amnesty is demanded. This Congress is concerned when it appears that

a college faculty capitulates to nonnegotiable demands at the point of guns. This Congress is concerned when the faculty of a liberal arts college of a great university votes to ask that criminal charges be dropped for over 200 students and faculty members who participated in a recent riot. This serves notice that the patience of this Congress of the American people is not unlimited. This is to serve notice to the far left that we are sick and tired of the violence we see in this country, and that this Congress is determined to do whatever it can to see that it is stopped. This is to serve notice to the small minority in the SDS, in the Black Panthers that this country will not tolerate the tyranny of the minority.

My committee, I believe, will have other legislation that we hope will be helpful in this situation. I hope that it will be considered in an atmosphere that is calm—that reason will prevail. I will not support legislation that will fall into the plans of the militants. I hope that this legislation will come to the floor of this House within the next few weeks. But I say that I see nothing repressive about the amendment that has been offered today, and I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania to close the debate.

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 made many important advances in our efforts to provide good housing and good neighborhoods for all of our citizens. There is nothing in the 17 titles of that bill, however, that is more important than the new interest subsidy programs designed to foster homeownership for families which could not otherwise afford it and a greatly expanded rental housing program. We all know the basic role which homeownership plays in our American way of life by giving families a sense of pride and dignity, a sense of responsibility for the community in which they live, and a sense of participation. The benefits of this aid for homeownership will go far beyond the individual families which receive them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for the positive approach which they have displayed on most items in the complex supplemental appropriation request. At the same time I deeply regret that they failed to authorize the full \$50 million request for each of the interest subsidy programs. I am hopeful that the other body will grant the full request and hold it in conference. Another reduction which deeply concerns me is the complete elimination of the modest request for funds to enable HUD to carry out its extensive responsibilities under the fair housing legislation. The \$2 million requested in this supplemental is sorely needed for responsible administration of these duties. Again I am hopeful that the other body will include the full amount in its bill. In addition we should all stand behind the budget requests for the

coming fiscal year which contains the full authorization for interest subsidies in the amount of \$100 million for each of the programs. In the case of fair housing funds, I am hopeful that the committee can be persuaded that the original budget proposal of \$14 million is fully justified.

Mr. Chairman, there is an urgent need to move ahead with housing legislation already on the books. My Subcommittee on Housing recently concluded hearings on our national housing goals and the witnesses were unanimous that these goals can be met if our existing authorizations are fully and promptly funded. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill today so that we can get on with the job of providing a good home and a decent environment for every American family.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SCHERLE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa: On page 14, delete lines 24 and 25 and on page 15, delete lines 1 and 2 and the first four words on line 3 and insert in lieu thereof: "\$7,241,000".

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this amendment eliminates the permission to begin a new program of interest subsidies for college construction in this supplemental bill. The bill carries \$3.9 million for this purpose. The Department has stated that if this permission is approved it will withhold direct loans from appropriations that have already been made for this fiscal year for the purpose of college construction.

Under this new program that they propose to fund, either colleges, junior colleges that are now being built, and universities, will sell bonds, and the Government will pay the interest above 3 percent. They do not propose to sell below face value in order to give an effective yield at the going rate of interest, and the Government pay the difference between the return and the face value, but instead to merely pay 1 year of the subsidy now, and then to go in debt for the rest, and pay it each year over a 35-year period.

So we see that obviously this is a gimmick to avoid the limitation in the Expenditure and Control Act of last year, or a gimmick to avoid the Mahon amendment limitation in this very same bill.

This proposition will cost \$140 million, but only \$3.9 million shows up in the budget, and we go into debt for the rest. This is only part of an overall plan that has been explained to us. In fiscal year 1970, they propose to spend \$7 million under the interest subsidy programs and to substitute that completely for the program of direct loans and grants to 4-year colleges. In other words, there will be no direct grants and no direct loans for

undergraduate and graduate schools if we approve this approach.

Now in the two bills—\$3.9 million plus \$7 million plus a second year payment of \$3.9 million is all that shows up.

The cost of the Government is \$440 million. But all that shows up in the budget is about \$15 million and we will pay the rest over a period of 35 years.

This is deficit financing and backdoor financing and defeats the limitations in the Bow and Mahon amendments and in addition to that it makes the time that we spent on debt limitation bills a waste of time.

To make it more palatable, now they call this, "relying more on the public sector." But a rose by some name is still a rose. No matter what they call it. It is nothing but deficit financing.

I would not mind so much if we did not hurt junior colleges and colleges and universities at the same time.

I was on this subcommittee chaired by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) when we developed the legislation that finally became this Higher Facilities Act. I thought we were trying to help the colleges, but now this is to be turned into a bill for the relief of investment bankers and it is not going to give the aid needed to the colleges.

The colleges face about a 50 percent or more increased enrollment in the next 7 or 8 years. They have already engaged in selling as many bonds as they feel they can market with the full interest rate. In addition to that, they need to get some grants and some direct loans to supplement what they can raise through contributions.

I think it is an involved subject and if we are going to substitute completely an interest subsidy program for the good college grant and direct loan programs, it should not be in a supplemental and it should be fully discussed here.

If we do not carry this amendment, then these debt limit bills, limitations on expenditures and the Expenditure Control Act, and the Nixon budget, which claimed a \$4 billion reduction, all are as phony as a \$3 bill.

If my amendment does not pass, the cost to the Federal Government will be more, most of the cost will be hidden and colleges will be in worse financial condition.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, it pains me that I must oppose my colleague on my subcommittee who is generally my strong right arm.

The facts are these. Congress authorized this method of financing in Public Law 90-575, approved just last October 16; so Congress is on record as being for it. The exact number of dollars and appropriation language that is in the bill was requested of the Congress by the Johnson administration; so the Johnson administration was for it. It was approved by the present Nixon administration; so they are for it. Of course, it would not be in the bill if the Committee on Appropriations were not for it.

Thus, under no circumstances will the appropriation circumvent the Mahon

and Bow expenditure limitation proposal which applies to the 1970 budget.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Is it not true that the force and effect of this amendment would be to return to Treasury borrowing?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. And that it would require the Treasury to go out into the market and borrow \$145 million for a program which we can handle in the way the committee proposes to handle it.

Mr. FLOOD. The only thing wrong with that statement is that I did not think of it. That is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Office of the Speaker: From and after March 1, 1969, the basic annual lump-sum ceiling allowance applicable under this appropriation is hereby increased by \$2,230.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NATCHER

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NATCHER: On page 16, strike out line 16 through 19, inclusive.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, this line item is no longer necessary. The amendment meets with the approval of the Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask why this item is being stricken.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. When the committee met, we were requested by the Speaker to increase the basic lump-sum ceiling allowance for his office. Since that time the Speaker has lost his most valuable "right arm," his former administrative assistant, and has now promoted his legislative assistant to that position. The situation has changed and there is now no occasion for the item. I believe the gentleman would agree.

Mr. GROSS. I agree and I appreciate the gentleman's explanation.

Now that we are on the subject of a pay increase, and since there are salary increases on almost every page of this bill, and it is hard to pull together in any one place information with respect to them, let me ask the gentleman this question: Where are the funds for the pay increases for the Members of Congress that went into effect recently?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Page 23, in another section of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Page 23, line 12.

Mr. GROSS. Page 23, line 12; and this is for what period of time for Members of the Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. To the end of the current fiscal year, that is, to midnight of June 30, 1969.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any funds in this bill, is there any forward funding in the bill providing pay increases for the leadership of the House and the other body? Are there any funds in this bill at all for the possible funding of the increase contained in the bill that passed the House and then was shelved in the Senate?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I again refer the gentleman to the figure on line 12, page 23, for the same period of time, for the rest of this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. For forward funding of the legislation that was passed by the House and that is now gathering dust over in the Senate? Surely there is no funding for the leaders' pay increase which has not been authorized.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Yes, it is in there.

Mr. GROSS. In the bill we are considering?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. You are putting up the money without an authorization?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We held these hearings over 2 months ago, and inserted the funds to carry out the bill which had passed the House at the time. I should add, of course, that the funds cannot be paid unless the House bill passes the Senate and becomes law.

Mr. GROSS. How much other money is there in this bill on the basis of forward funding for items that have never been authorized by the Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Referring to the bill in question, one-third of the annual amount involved. The actual amount would be \$19,835.

Mr. GROSS. One-third of the annual amount involved?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. For these particular jobs.

Mr. GROSS. For these particular jobs?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The funds cannot be expended unless they are authorized. There is some money here in anticipation of authorization. That money remains in the bill, but as final action has not been taken on the legislative authorization, it is still alive as an issue, and there is nothing to be gained by striking this from the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Then this is not even a supplemental appropriation bill? Is this the procedure of the House Appropriations Committee to put in the supplemental bills funds for items that are not even authorized by Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, we have not had a situation like this since I have been on the committee. This is the last supplemental bill for the current year and the last opportunity for the committee to fund these increased salaries—if the bill becomes law. The funds are in here on that contingency.

Mr. GROSS. If the leader's pay in-

crease becomes law, there would be every opportunity to bring a bill to the House floor.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I hope this will be the last supplemental bill for this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean it could not put it in a regular appropriation bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We will not have another one affecting this particular subject.

Mr. GROSS. Will we not have a house-keeping bill before this session is over?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we will not have an appropriation bill for the legislative establishment for the remainder of this fiscal year. I doubt if we will get the regular legislative bill for fiscal year 1970 on the floor before the 1st of July.

Mr. GROSS. This is a most unusual procedure, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I say to the gentleman this is the first time we have had a situation like this since I have been on the committee. The money cannot be spent, and will revert to the Treasury if the bill now pending before the other body does not become law.

Mr. GROSS. If it is not acted upon by July 1.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. That is correct. The extra funds can only be used if the bill pending in the other body becomes law.

Mr. GROSS. Then what is the gentleman going to do if the bill subsequently is passed?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We will not have anything to act on.

Mr. GROSS. After July 1, if the bill subsequently is passed by the other body, then what will the gentleman do in order to get the money for the leadership?

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. We are meeting that contingency, making provision for that contingency in this bill. I say to the gentleman that this is the last opportunity this fiscal year that we will have to fund the increased salaries if the bill becomes law and the salaries are increased. If the bill does not become law, then the money will not be spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$1,978,000; (and release of \$334,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee about the increase of nearly \$2 million—apparently it becomes more than \$2 million if we take into account the release of other funds—for the Bureau of Public Debt. Why would there be a supplemental in this regard?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. In this item of operation in the Government there are certain fees they have to pay to the Federal Reserve Banks and to the commercial banks throughout the country for services rendered in the cashing of bonds and other transactions. The major part of this item here is what is needed to finish paying the claims they will have for the remainder of this fiscal year. The volume of this sort of business is turning out to be considerably more than the original estimates over a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. So the debt is going up? Is that what the gentleman is saying and increasing the business of the Bureau of the Public Debt?

Mr. STEED. Some of this item could be attributed to the fact that the debt has gone up. Most of it is in the item of reimbursement we make to the Federal Reserve Banks and to the commercial banks for various services they perform for the Treasury Department.

Mr. GROSS. But that deals with the Federal debt. What is the total appropriation for the operation of the Bureau of the Public Debt? What is the annual cost this one agency of the Government to administer what it does with respect to the Federal debt?

Mr. STEED. I think, with the approval of the supplemental, it will bring the total cost for this item for this year to \$58 million.

Mr. GROSS. Between \$58 million and \$60 million, is that correct?

Mr. STEED. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me the \$3 million which was just approved for culture could very well have been used to take care of the running expenses of the Bureau of the Public Debt. The public debt now is around \$370 billion. Is the interest alone on the debt about \$16 billion a year? What is the latest figure?

Mr. STEED. The interest on the public debt for the coming fiscal year is estimated to be \$17.3 billion.

Mr. GROSS. \$17.3 billion. It is going up fast. So is the cost of administering it. I can remember when that cost was down to around \$20 million. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. STEED. It has gone up \$300 million in the estimate since last January.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS
Compensation of Members, \$1,975,000;
SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES
"Office of the Speaker", \$4,015;
POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 23, lines 12, 13, and 14, on the ground that, as admitted by the committee, this contains moneys to be appropriated that have not been authorized by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire: Does the gentleman's point of order refer to lines 12, 13, and 14?

Mr. GROSS. Lines 11, 12, 13, and 14.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, I believe, does not seek to reduce funds for the Office of the Speaker, as shown on line 14. The gentleman is, I believe, only referring to the pay increase for the Speaker and other Members—the item on line 12.

Mr. GROSS. Very frankly, I do not know which one of these line items contains all the funds, so I am just trying to take as much as I can to be sure I get the funds covered. If the gentleman will tell me what line they are in I will amend my point of order, with the permission of the Chair.

Mr. MAHON. The funds which have not been authorized are included in line 12, in the \$1,975,000 figure.

Mr. GROSS. Those are the only funds that have not been authorized?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; that is the figure involved. A small portion of that has not been authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a clarifying question on the part of the Chair? As the Chair reads this language it says, "for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law." If the Chair understands language, this refers to a cost already authorized by and pursuant to law that is now in existence. Is that true?

Mr. MAHON. The Chair is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. GROSS. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. The committee admits there are funds contained in line 12 that are not authorized by law.

Mr. MAHON. The \$19,835 included in line 12 has not been authorized. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. You mean the \$1,975,000?

Mr. MAHON. No; \$19,835 has not been authorized. But it cannot be paid unless it is authorized. Otherwise, it would revert unused to the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair again is confused. The Chair sees no reference

to a figure of \$19,835 in the bill or in the language referred to here.

Mr. MAHON. It is part of the figure of \$1,975,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas state to the Chair that of the amount of \$1,975,000 there is \$19,835 that is not authorized?

Mr. MAHON. \$19,835.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is still in a quandary because the language in line 7 says, "for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, all compensation due by law to Members of Congress is authorized. If it is not authorized, it cannot be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. And this is for compensation for Members. Unless you go behind these figures it is clear that the whole sum would be authorized. What other sum Congress wishes to authorize can be authorized. It could be considerably above the \$1,975,000 because it is for the compensation of Members. If the figure is too high or in error, it is still authorized by law, because there is authorization for the payment of Members. Therefore, I have some doubt that the point of order lies against this. But the debate has disclosed the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to hold that the gentleman's point of order is not well taken, because the money amount in line 12 cannot be used for any other purpose than increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law. Therefore, the gentleman's point of order is overruled.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. What was the purpose of the bill which passed the House and is now in the hands of the Senate with no action taken upon it in that body? That was the authorization bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, of course, does not have that language before him and cannot answer the gentleman's question.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 23, line 12, strike "\$1,975,000" and insert "\$1,068,789".

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. This amendment simply deducts \$906,211, which is the amount of pay increase for ourselves in this body and on which we did not vote at any time. It does not apply to the 2 months which have already been paid.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, this would deduct that amount of this ap-

proprietion for our pay increase, only for the months of May and June. Assuming there is no forward funding in this portion of the \$1,975,000 that pertains to the pay of the Members of the House of Representatives, by taking one-sixth of \$12,500, times the number of Members in this House, one arrives at this figure. Deducting it from the \$1,975,000, we have the remainder of \$1,068,789. It does not affect the pay of the judiciary or the executive branches.

The entire purpose of this amendment is clear cut. It is to avoid any more of the "sky being the limit" philosophy of raising our own pay. It is to get back in the groove and on the right track with the general belt tightening, the general economy and cuts that we are asking other branches, departments and people to make. It is starting at the epitomy and establishing a top in priority, where economy should begin and that is with ourselves. It is an attempt to rescind, in the hope that we can continue to rectify, when the next appropriation act affecting legislation of the pay of the Members themselves in fiscal year 1970 occurs, instead of the "Valentine's massacre" which I referred to on the floor of this House once before, as a massacre of the taxpayers when it was known that this pay raise which was brought on by this Commission would become effective on February 11, 1969. It did not. It became effective March 1, 1969. We have been paid for that and for the month of April, and this amendment calls for no retroactivity or payback of the Members.

This would simply deduct that amount which will be paid for in May and June, the balance of this fiscal year 1969.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the future good judgment of the Members of the House will preclude further payment in fiscal year 1970. It is that simple.

I urge support from those of you who have received many letters demeaning you for allowing a pay increase to go through without asserting or working the will of the House and voting ourselves in this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that my friend from Missouri has offered this amendment. We have long been joined in the fight against the unconscionable pay increase for Members of Congress, the judiciary, and the executive branch of Government.

It is most unfortunate that under the law it is impossible to get at the pay increases for others, some of whose paychecks were increased by an outrageous 70 percent.

Here is the opportunity by supporting the amendment to rectify part of the mistake that was made when the pay increase bill was slipped through the backdoor of the House while the Members were conveniently on vacation last February.

And the Members of the House should be on notice, that unless the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is adopted, a vote for this supplemental appropriation will be a vote for the first time by the Members of the House to give themselves an unconscionable 41-percent increase.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there are a variety of views in the House with respect to the pay raise which was made effective for members of the judicial and executive and legislative branches of the Government. Some of us thought that a pay raise, while clearly justifiable in some respects was not timely at the moment it was put into effect and that the amount of the raise was too great.

I was among the group opposing the pay raise, but the pay raise has been enacted into law, and it is the law of the land. It has been in effect since March 1.

If this law is to be changed, then it is a matter for the appropriate committee of the Congress to consider, and it would be very inappropriate through this procedure to undertake to nullify the law with regard to one of the branches of the Government involving the pay raise.

So, regardless of one's original views as to the wisdom of the pay raise, to me it is clearly out of order at this time to undertake on an appropriation bill to revise or to modify the law with respect to the pay raise. The proper procedure would be through a legislative bill covering the entire Government and worked out by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and presented to the House.

There was not a direct vote on the pay raise legislation this year. There was a rollcall vote in 1967 when the Commission was authorized to set up a pay raise scale for officials of the Government. I was among those who voted against that proposal but it became the law.

As I stated, there was no direct vote on the pay raise issue this year but there was a rollcall vote in regard to the issue. Prior to the Lincoln Day recess it was proposed that the House not recess without taking a vote on the issue of the pay raise. I was among those voting not to adjourn for the recess because adjournment would have precluded any chance for a vote on the issue. I voted not to adjourn without taking action on the pay raise issue but a majority vote was to the contrary. This vote related to the issue but was, of course, not a direct vote on the issue. The debate in the House on February 5 just prior to the vote on adjournment made clear that the pay raise was the issue.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if it is not true that, if this amendment were adopted, the entire pay raise and all parts thereof would be nullified.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, it would cover the entire pay raise, as I understand it.

Mr. ALBERT. The Members could not get any portion of the pay raise.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; as I understand it, it would eliminate all the pay raises for the members of the legislative branch, but not other branches of the Government.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I fully share the views of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in urging that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close, and I ask for a vote.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HALL and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 165.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the remainder of title III of the bill deals in various pay raises for the various agencies of the government, funds to meet those pay raises as provided by law, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title III be considered as read; in other words, that the bill be considered as read up to line 5, page 61, which is the end of title III, and that the bill be open for amendment up to that point.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, did the gentleman say page 61?

Mr. MAHON. Up to line 5, page 61, which would be the end of these various parts relating to various portions of the Government—the end of title III of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Amendments would be in order?

Mr. MAHON. Amendments would be in order to that section.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman, under my reservation, one question: Does the gentleman have any idea of the amount of salary increases carried in this \$4 billion supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman mean the pay raises to all agencies of the Government?

Mr. GROSS. The total contained in the bill.

Mr. MAHON. That total is contained in the chapter of the report entitled "Increased Pay Costs," that can be found on page 73 of the report. The total amount shown is approximately \$1.3 billion.

Mr. GROSS. \$1.3 billion?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Out of a \$3.8 billion appropriation?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; \$1.2 billion plus is in title I for the Defense Department for the war in Vietnam; title III relates to pay raise money for the various agencies and departments of the Government. There are some pay costs in title II. The pay raises were brought about by actions

of the last Congress, as the report explains on page 73.

Pay funds in titles II and III—which are recapitulated on page 73 of the report—total just under \$1.3 billion.

Title II, of course, contains a number of supplementals not related to pay costs.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if, in that portion which the Clerk has just read prior to the unanimous-consent request, there is, to his knowledge, any more forward funding of the pay increase of the employees of the House? Those that I will speak of as the "employees" of the House?

Mr. MAHON. So far as I know, there is none whatever.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is considered as read to line 5, page 61. Amendments are in order. Are there any amendments?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

A moment ago, when my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. UDALL), came down to the well and took 30 seconds of his 5 minutes, I had hoped to catch his attention because I wanted to tell him that, despite the fact that I had labored long and hard on a statement in support of a pay cut for this body, and despite the fact that I am aware that the gentleman from Arizona, himself, put in a lot of time this afternoon preparing an appropriate attack upon my amendment, nevertheless, I witnessed with tears in my eyes the expression of the sentiment of the House on the pay-cut amendment offered by my friend from Missouri, and I want the gentleman from Arizona and the rest of the Members of this body to know that I accept the decision as final.

Accordingly, I will not offer my amendment.

My amendment in effect would have placed a temporary ceiling of \$36,250 on congressional salaries. This would reduce by one-half the recent pay increase.

This was not an appealing amendment for me to consider offering nor for Members to contemplate voting upon. No one will contemplate a cut in his pay with enthusiasm. Most of us believe—justifiably I hope—that we are worth every penny of \$42,500. The expenses of running a congressional office are enormous and often outstrip our allowance. And on top of it all, I can tell you that the Findley family has encountered no difficulty spending all of my paycheck. With this in mind, I recognize that acceptance of my amendment would have been truly extraordinary—an unprecedented event.

Unprecedented is also the right word to describe the factors which motivated me to draft the amendment.

Inflation is the most serious domestic problem confronting us today. In March of this year, the increase in the cost of living was the largest since February 1951. Consumer prices have risen more in the first quarter of this year than at any time since 1956. Unless we bring this under control quickly, we are in serious trouble.

Fiscal restraint is a necessity, and nothing would be more helpful than for Congress itself to show some restraint. The bill before us now which includes money for the salary increase quite properly includes what is described as a "rigid" limitation on total federal expenditures. Because of budget pressures, many needed federal programs are being cut back or eliminated, and the surtax undoubtedly will be extended. The outlook for an increase in social security benefits is unclear to say the least.

In light of these factors, the 41-percent increase in congressional pay was poorly timed, to say the least, and the outrage which taxpayers have voiced is completely understandable. If the increase had been staged over 2 or 3 years, it would have been more acceptable.

In this period of deep fiscal crisis, when an emergency surtax is required, Congress should attempt to set an example for the rest of the country.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 61, after line 4 insert the following:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"The Commission on Executive, Judicial, and Legislative Salaries established under Public Law 90-206 is hereby abolished. The salary increases recommended by the President as a result of the actions of said Commission are hereby rescinded."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve points of order on the amendment on the ground that it appears to be legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas reserves points of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas reserving points of order in order that I may speak to this amendment.

Again this is a straightforward open-faced amendment. I do not accept the fact that our action here today on my prior amendment decision is final, especially without the Members of this House of Representatives ever having voted on their own pay increase. It is true that they did vote on the Commission as established for executive, judicial, and legislative salaries, back in 1967.

Up to this time, I have tried to be careful and be within the dictates of the Constitution. Members will note that the last amendment involved no one—those stating to the contrary notwithstanding—except we who are in the legislative branch and indeed we in this House of Representatives.

Now, of course, under the restrictions or rescindments or actions under rule XXI and the "Holman rule," we can, in

in an appropriation bill, take action by the act of the House to eliminate anything that costs additional expense from the General Treasury and that has been acted on previously.

I think that the amendment is in order. Certainly it is germane. Certainly it is a retrenchment on its face.

Very simply, this amendment would eliminate the Commission that has poor backing, poor strategy, and has been demonstrated to have poor timing, in that it has recommended without any vote of the Members and with them able to evade—as indeed we did in January and February—confrontation with a vote on our constitutional requirement to raise our own pay, which is just as much a requirement as it is for us to raise and support the armed services.

I do not believe we ever should have delegated this to the responsibility of the executive branch. I think it is time that we had an amendment to abolish the Pay Commission, which does retrench expenditures by the reduction of the salaries of the officers of the United States and, therefore, falls under the "Holman rule." This rule allows us to legislate in an appropriation bill—and there are resplendent examples, and many areas in which we can prove that it has been accepted in the past, and they can be quoted both from Cannon's Procedures and from our own manual.

Be that as it may, Mr. Chairman, all of us knew what the salaries were when we ran for office. Few of us have found that there was a sparsity of those who were ready to run against us at the same income rate. Many of us serve in the interest of representative government and the Republic as a duty, and at a financial sacrifice.

Finally, I think we should have stood and been counted on our bill setting up this spurious Commission and I am giving one additional chance for everyone to vote in support of abolishing it. Its being delegates our authority as legislators, our constitutional rights, and indeed our responsibilities, to the executive branch every 4 years to designate what the salaries of the executive and the judicial and the legislative branch will be.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am in complete sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, but I advise the gentleman that under article III of the Constitution it says the pay of judges shall not be diminished during their continuance in office, and I wonder how a rescission of pay increase as provided in the gentleman's amendment would apply to the salary of the judges.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, that was in the amendment that was defeated on the vote a while ago. The intent here is to abolish the Commission.

It would abolish the Commission which would in the future bring forth recommendations every 4 years, and they would go into effect unless one or the

other body of Congress took action against them within 60 days, having been revised down from the 90 days according to the original Reorganization Act of 1949.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I thank the gentleman. I apologize for having misunderstood the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Did I understand the gentleman's amendment as read abolished the Commission and abolished the pay raise the Commission ordered?

Mr. HALL. I would be glad to ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread. It simply intends to abolish the Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, again I wish to commend my colleague from Missouri for offering this amendment which would repeal the authority of a Presidentially appointed and Presidentially annointed commission to recommend the salaries of Members of Congress.

This is one of the most unholy delegations of power and authority ever made by Congress. To give a commission—any commission—and the President—any President—the power to recommend the pay of Congress is unthinkable.

No Member of the House or Senate should want to be in any way a pawn of any President and this amendment seeks to restore the independence of the legislative branch—independence which was supinely delegated in the 1967 pay act.

The time to correct that mistake is here and now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this is a supplemental appropriation bill. I renew my point of order on two grounds: First, the proposal of the gentleman from Missouri is legislation on an appropriation bill; and, second, it is not germane to the supplemental appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has examined the amendment and the precedents, and would call attention of the House to Cannon's Precedents, volume 8, page 480, section 2914, which reads as follows: "to a section proposing legislation for the current year an amendment rendering such legislation permanent was held not to be germane."

Then, in section 2915: "to a provision in an appropriation bill proposing legislation for the fiscal year provided for by the bill an amendment proposing to make the provision permanent legislation was held not to be germane."

The Chair therefore rules that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is not germane and therefore not in order; and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I wish to apologize to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) because on rereading the typed amendment—a copy of which I supplied him—I observe the last sentence does include therein—and this apology also would go to the gentle-

man from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON)—the elimination of the actions taken by the Commission which I sought to eliminate. I offer my apology. I made a misstatement of fact, and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in assuming that the portion of the bill beginning on line 5, page 61, has not been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAHON. I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN: On page 61, line 5, strike out all of title IV and renumber title V on page 62 as title IV.

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, as I announced earlier, at the time we were considering the rule, I rise in opposition to the expenditure limitation placed on fiscal year 1970 outlays by this supplemental appropriation bill, and, of course, my amendment moves to strike title IV limitation entirely.

I want the Committee to know I did not arrive at this conclusion lightly. I pondered long and hard over the meaning and the effects of the limitation. As a matter of fact, earlier I was disposed to support the measure on the theory that this was the beginning of a possible legislative budget. I recognize the desirability of an annual congressional assessment of the appropriate levels of Federal revenues and expenditures.

In fact, as Members may know, I strongly endorse the fine recommendations of our former Secretary of the Treasury, Joe Barr, for the creation of a legislative budget.

I recognize, too, the need to maintain a restrained fiscal policy so that rising prices may be controlled.

However, I recognize, also, that the all too likely outcome of this ceiling—and mark this, please—the all too likely outcome to this ceiling is to guarantee substantial cuts in spending for urgently needed social programs.

Let me explain.

Under the provisions of this limitation total Federal spending for the 12 months of the next fiscal year cannot exceed \$192.9 billion unless Congress takes specific action to increase expenditures. This ceiling will be reduced by the amount of the spending reductions implicit in appropriation cuts which will, no doubt, be made in some areas by the Congress. The trouble is that the budget contains a very large number of mere estimates as to expenditures. Most of these estimated items represent civilian open-ended or fixed-cost programs. These are programs like social security, public assistance, medicaid, farm subsidies, veterans' benefits, and interest on the national debt. I refer you to page 16 of the President's 1970 budget on this.

These are all expenditures which the Government is by law committed to meet. Thus, if spending for these programs exceeds the budget estimates, the excess will have to be taken from spending for some other programs also authorized by the Congress.

Reductions in spending to offset these unbudgeted increases can be made only in that portion of the budget which is controllable.

The fact is that the controllable portion of the budget is comparatively small, and it contains almost all the social programs—such as antipoverty, education, health, job training, and housing—which a good many of us strongly believe must be substantially increased and not decreased.

Estimates of outlays for fiscal year 1970 show this: \$81.1 billion in civilian noncontrollable programs like social security and veterans' benefits. Our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, and others devoted to the veterans' programs were on the floor speaking about this today. Of the remaining \$111.8 billion, Defense accounts for \$80.4 billion, and \$31.4 billion is for other accounts. However, of the \$31.4 billion, \$18.9 billion is accounted for by uncontrollable expenditures due on obligations entered into in the previous fiscal year. This leaves us only with \$12.5 billion in civilian controllable expenditures.

If the current fiscal year is any example, the noncontrollable items will exceed their estimates by \$3 billion to \$6 billion and, if the practice of taking the reductions out of the hides of the social programs, rather than defense spending, is again followed, we could well find that spending for controllable domestic programs will have to be cut back by a staggering 25 to 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an aye vote on this amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the proposal for an expenditure limitation, as set out in title IV of the bill, has been debated for 2 days.

The proposal, as explained in the committee report, has been available for

Members to review for 5 or 6 days. The matter was rather thoroughly discussed at the time we had the rule before the House today and the rule was passed overwhelmingly. This does not necessarily mean that everyone who voted for the rule is for the expenditure limitation. But, undoubtedly, the overwhelming majority of those who voted for the rule are in favor of the expenditure limitation.

The proposal was extensively debated here yesterday. I refer especially to the debate beginning on page H3830 of the RECORD of yesterday.

The gentleman from California has somewhat oversimplified the problem and the purpose of what is actually proposed in the expenditure limitation. I see no reason to belabor this issue further. We have had opportunity to discuss it in great depth previously and have done so.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS).

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I asked the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to yield is to agree with the chairman that this suggestion has been thoroughly explored on yesterday and today. I concur in the chairman's views. I think this spending limitation will have a salutary effect. Therefore, I am opposed to the amendment and I join the chairman in asking that it be voted down.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment do now close and that all debate on the bill do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COHELAN of California: On page 62, line 3, add the following as a new section:

"(c) The limitation set forth in subsection (a), as adjusted in accordance with the proviso to that subsection, shall be increased by an amount equal to the aggregate amount by which expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for the fiscal year 1970 on account of items designated as "Open-ended programs and fixed costs" in the table appearing on page 16 of the Budget for the fiscal year 1970 may be in excess of the aggregate expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) estimated for those items in the April review of the 1970 budget."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment in that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. Chairman, the rule pertaining to title IV only protects what is in the bill, not amendments to the bill.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is to exempt from the

outlay limitation noncontrollable civilian expenditures. It is what I regard as a fallback amendment, just to make sure that if we are going to have this expenditure ceiling we are not going to take it out of the hide of the noncontrollable expenditures.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is to insure that social programs will not be needlessly reduced by exempting from outlay limitations noncontrollable civilian expenditures.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman speaking on the point of order raised by the chairman of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair has requested the gentleman from California to speak on the point of order, and the Chair assumes that the gentleman is so doing.

Mr. COHELAN. On the point of order, Mr. Chairman, I am merely trying to explain the amendment, and its validity and its germaneness. It is similar to one offered by the Bureau of the Budget, and other provisions of last year's Expenditure Control Act. It differs only in that it calls for South Vietnam expenses to be controllable, and thus would not exempt them from the budget ceiling. There is also an additional advantage to my amendment which I could explain if I had the time, but in sum my amendment would insure that if the budget estimates for noncontrollable civilian expenditure programs were low, the increase would not have to come from expenditures in housing, health, education, job training, and the like.

It also treats all defense expenditures as controllable items.

Mr. MAHON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The gentleman is discussing the merits of the proposed amendment, and not the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has examined title IV. This is a new subparagraph to title IV. Title IV is legislation in a general appropriation bill, and all points of order have been waived in title IV, as a result of it being legislation. Therefore the Chair holds that the amendment is germane to the provisions contained in title IV and overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Did not the previous unanimous-consent action of the House eliminate all further general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COHELAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, is it all right for me to urge a "yea" vote on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, but I cannot talk about it, as I understand.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 61, line 10, After "\$192,900,000,000," insert ", of which the amount expended by the Department of Defense shall not exceed \$77,500,000,000".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous action of the Committee, all further debate has been eliminated.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, am I barred by the motion that was adopted previously? Does that preclude me from telling the House that this is a \$2.5 billion reduction?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Ohio is precluded from debate on his amendment in view of the action taken by the House on the limitation of debate.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VANIK and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 38, noes 165.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the expenditure ceiling that would hold spending next year to the \$192 billion level. I have already voted for the rule. Later today I must leave and may not be here for final passage of the bill due to a commitment I made to the student leaders at Virginia Polytechnic Institute several months ago. Tonight I will talk with the students at VPI about present campus unrest and academic freedom, and I feel I should honor this commitment. If I were here to vote on final passage, I would vote to hold spending to the \$192 billion level and reduce Federal spending wherever possible.

One of the greatest problems facing our country today is spiraling inflation. The housewife is finding her grocery bills are higher each week. The consumer is being shortchanged. Excessive Government spending bears down most heavily on the American housewife, the elderly, those drawing retirement benefits and pensions, and the American wage earner.

Last year I voted in favor of the \$6 billion cut in Federal spending. The question before the House now is the same as it was then—the stability, integrity,

and purchasing power of the American dollar. We must cut every nonessential expenditure of the Federal Government and save the American dollar.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, like so many Americans, I am opposed to the war in Vietnam, but I have voted for the supplemental appropriations bill which has nearly one-third of its expenditures earmarked for military operations in Southeast Asia.

I have listened to opponents of the bill who have argued that Congress could halt the war by refusing to authorize the military appropriations. On that basis, they have sought rejection of this bill in spite of the fact that more than two-thirds of the appropriations are for non-military purposes.

I supported an amendment to have the military appropriations voted on separately and I regret that the majority of my colleagues rejected this move. It would have brought the war into focus and would have given us the opportunity of concentrating completely on that very important matter.

As the bill now stands, we have very little discretionary control over these nonmilitary appropriations which represent the lion's share of the expenditures because the previous Congress has committed us to them. They involve, for example, grants to States for health and welfare; veterans compensation; medical and other costs; unemployment compensation payments; military retirement pay; college housing; social and rehabilitation services and disaster relief.

They are obligations that require fiscal responsibility and must be met.

If we rejected this bill because of its military appropriations at a time when we are at the conference table negotiating for peace, I fear the consequences could be disastrous. We would be announcing to the world that we no longer intend to defend ourselves. We would be going to the conference table with no cards at all.

Yes, let us hasten the process for peace. I agree that we are lingering too long at the conference table. I agree that our boys should be returned to American soil. I agree that they should not have to sacrifice their lives in the jungles of a foreign land where we are engaged in the most unpopular war in our history.

But while Americans are fighting in Vietnam, we have an abiding responsibility to give them everything they need for survival. Our fighting forces have brought the Communists to the point where they are trying to achieve at the conference table what they could not achieve on the battlefield.

Are we to tell the world at this time that we are abandoning our military effort; that we are pulling our purse strings tight? I am sure that now, more than ever, is the time for solidarity at home. I am convinced that we must stand united if we are to secure a meaningful peace at the conference table.

The military sector of this bill is designed to permit the South Vietnamese forces to assume a greater share of the burden of battle and to enforce peace when it comes.

Two major events that have occurred since the original budget requests for fis-

cal 1969 were submitted to Congress also contribute largely to the need for the passage of this bill. I am referring to the Tet offensive in Vietnam which caused losses of equipment far in excess of what was anticipated and the seizure of the *Pueblo* by the North Koreans which led to the callup of military forces to meet this military threat.

While I support this bill chiefly for the reasons set forth here, I remain deeply concerned about a war that has already taken 35,000 American lives and has caused our Nation to become most restless. The administration and this Congress must give the utmost priority to the attainment of an honorable peace in Vietnam. Every effort must be exerted to accomplish that goal as soon as possible.

I believe we can attain the peace we want under the circumstances we want reasonably soon if our Government does not buckle under the task that lies ahead and instead carries unity and strength to the conference table. That is why I do not oppose the military appropriations at this time.

After considering all facets of this bill and its importance to America at home and abroad, I could do nothing less than urge its passage.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, there are several necessary and desirable items included in this bill, but I shall vote against the bill as a whole if the unnecessary appropriations for additional procurement and other items related to the war in Vietnam remain intact.

If the bill were to be defeated at this stage, which would be most surprising, it could be promptly resubmitted to the House in appropriately modified form.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 made many important advances in our efforts to provide good housing and good neighborhoods for all of our citizens. There is nothing in the 17 titles of that bill, however, that is more important than the new interest subsidy programs designed to foster homeownership for families which could not otherwise afford it and a greatly expanded rental housing program. We all know the basic role which homeownership plays in our American way of life by giving families a sense of pride and dignity, a sense of responsibility for the community in which they live, and a sense of participation. The benefits of this aid for homeownership will go far beyond the individual families which receive them.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on Appropriations for the positive approach which they have displayed on most items in the complex supplemental appropriation request. At the same time I deeply regret that they failed to authorize the full \$50 million request for each of the interest subsidy programs. I am hopeful that the other body will grant the full request and hold it in conference. Another reduction which deeply concerns me is the complete elimination of the modest request for funds to enable HUD to carry out its extensive responsibilities under the fair housing legislation. The \$2 million requested in this supplemental is sorely needed for responsible administration of

these duties. Again, I am hopeful that the other body will include the full amount in its bill. In addition, we should all stand behind the budget requests for the coming fiscal year which contains the full authorization for interest subsidies in the amount of \$100 million for each of the programs. In the case of fair housing funds, I am hopeful that the committee can be persuaded that the original budget proposal of \$14 million is fully justified.

Mr. Chairman, there is an urgent need to move ahead with housing legislation already on the books. My Subcommittee on Housing recently concluded hearings on our national housing goals and the witnesses were unanimous that these goals can be met if our existing authorizations are fully and promptly funded. I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill today so that we can get on with the job of providing a good home and a decent environment for every American family.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman for his courage in offering this amendment.

The whole pay package adopted pursuant to the Koppel Commission is inflationary. Unfortunately the parliamentary situation will not permit an amendment to attack the other pay increases or for the abolition of the Commission.

Let me say, the taxpayers are entitled to have the whole pay package voted on by their representatives in this body. The only way that can happen is for Members to sign the discharge petition on H.R. 7778. There has been no stampede to the Clerk's desk, and I suppose the prospects are rather slim that we will get a vote on that bill.

But, we can begin to regain the respect of the taxpayers if we approve this amendment—which I confess is unlikely.

As the author of H.R. 7778 to repeal the whole Koppel package. As the sponsor of the discharge petition, I can say to the gentlemen he is to be congratulated for his courage. This amendment will not win him many friends here. I know. But the gentleman well represents his people and the sentiment of the country. I urge a favorable vote.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of amendments to this bill, I expect to offer an amendment to title IV to provide that the expenditure limitation of \$192,900 million shall include a further limitation of expenditures by the Department of Defense of \$77,500 million.

This amendment would reduce defense expenditures by \$2½ billion from budgetary requests of approximately \$80 billion. It appears that there is no other way to achieve reduced defense spending. This amendment would leave the discretion for spending cutbacks within the Defense Department and the further action of Congress.

Better housekeeping in the Defense Department should make it possible to reduce the overall expenditures by 3 percent without impairing any essential defense need.

Recent reports of waste in the purchase of defective aircraft, tanks, and leaky submarines indicate that too little attention is directed toward careful

management and prudent economy in our Defense Establishment.

If the civilian sector of our Government can face budgetary cutbacks of almost \$3 billion, it seems to me that the defense sector should make the same kind of an effort.

I cannot support legislation which exempts the military sector from effective congressional oversight.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, there are those who make these regular supplemental appropriations a test of support or dissent regarding our policy in Vietnam. This strikes me as a superficial and erroneous interpretation of the legislative process.

An examination of the legislation turns up item after item of national concern. There are within this appropriation specific allocations that cannot be refused without doing serious harm to important domestic programs. The following examples of specific requests in this \$3.8 billion appropriation make this point rather clearly:

The vital programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are scheduled to receive an additional \$666.7 million through this appropriation. An important new program of interest subsidies for higher education facilities construction is included within this allocation.

Included in this appropriation is a nondiscretionary appropriation of \$35.9 million for the Department of Labor for unemployment and employee compensation claims. Obviously these are expenses that must be met.

Recognizing the grave national problem caused by a shortage of low- and middle-income housing this appropriation provides \$80 million for the homeownership and rental housing interest subsidy programs.

Included in the appropriation is \$25.4 million for the vital conservation programs of the Department of Interior.

The National Transportation Safety Board which is involved in the crucial matters of flight, rail, and auto safety is to receive additional funds under this appropriation. The merit of such an expenditure is patently obvious.

These are just examples of the needed and obligated expenditures to be covered by this supplemental appropriation.

Also contained in this legislation is a necessary ceiling on Federal expenditures for fiscal 1970. This ceiling is set at the administration's requested budget of \$192.9 billion and is a first step in reducing Federal spending in a wide variety of wasteful, unnecessary, and duplicative areas.

Establishment of this ceiling at this time, with the expectation that a lower ceiling and spending cuts can be established when tax legislation is considered, is an important means of controlling the steadily rising Federal budget.

In another realm this appropriation contains the funds for mandated pay for Federal employees. This accounts for \$1.3 billion or more than a third of the appropriation. This part of the Federal payroll is established by law and obligated. Therefore the funds must be appropriated or we will cause budgetary havoc in the various departments and agencies of Government.

Now, turning to the matter of Vietnam, it must be noted that the appropriation does include \$1.2 billion for military operations in Southeast Asia with a substantial amount of this to be used to cover expenses resulting from increasing tensions in Korea.

But the fact remains that the largest part of this section of the supplemental appropriation involves expenses connected with the war in Vietnam. This is not, however, a new appropriation. Nor will these funds affect our search for peace.

The appropriation will be used to pay for materials already contracted for by the Defense Department. By appropriating these funds we are discharging a commitment of the Federal Government for these are truly obligated moneys for defensive and support operations in the field.

As I have said in the past, I do not believe we can responsibly deny a single American boy in Vietnam the material to defend himself.

As I reiterate that these are obligated funds already contracted for, it becomes clear that we have no choice but to approve the appropriation. I am prepared to vote for the appropriation with the knowledge that these funds will not be used to enlarge the scope of the war in Vietnam and with the knowledge that contained herein are the funds for many important domestic programs.

Now there is no one more interested in achieving peace in Vietnam than I. Since coming to Congress more than 4 years ago I have repeatedly dissented from our policy in Vietnam in order to offer proposals for peace.

And I am deeply disappointed that we have failed to make greater strides for peace. The President's recent message acknowledged something I have said for years, "We must take risks for peace," and I believe we must do exactly that.

When, I ask, when will we take these necessary steps to end the war? The continued loss of American lives and the steady flow of our needed resources into Vietnam is a responsibility that the new administration cannot escape. Peace in Vietnam is essential if we are to join the domestic wars against poverty, hunger, joblessness, inadequate housing, and substandard education. Certainly these domestic needs deserve a priority.

Moreover as one who has long dissented from American policy in Vietnam, I must repeat my strong feeling of unhappiness at the failure of the South Vietnamese to assume their role in the fighting. For months we have been told that the South Vietnamese will take on a greater combat role enabling us to begin bringing American boys home. I am tired of waiting for this action. If the South Vietnamese are not prepared to fight their own war I see no reason why we should fight it for them.

The appropriation before us today, however, is not a test of support or dissent on the matter of Vietnam. Although I dissociate myself from our unsuccessful and inexcusable policy errors in Vietnam, I would consider a vote against this appropriation irresponsible and a dereliction of my duty as a Member of the Congress.

But I also consider it the height of ir-

responsibility to give American lives in a war for a people that are unwilling to protect themselves.

Just as the Congress must vote approval of the appropriation before us today, so must the administration immediately move toward peace in Vietnam. To do less would be to violate the trust of the American people.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, after much travail and thought, I have concluded that I must vote against the passage of this bill.

In arriving at this position in opposition to the bill I have given consideration to the demands for fiscal restraint, to the virtues of the committee's action in support of low-cost housing to the purchase of additional lands for the Redwood National Park, and to other necessary and worthwhile programs. However, I have also given consideration to the potentially devastating effects of the expenditure ceiling, to the implications of continued funding of Vietnam expenditures at their present levels, and to the intrusion of the Federal Government into university affairs as provided in amendments to the bill.

On balance, I have concluded that there is more bad than good in this bill.

I would like for a moment to expand on these compelling considerations.

I have been a strong supporter of the efforts to enact and secure full funding for the section 235 homeownership assistance program and for the section 236 rental assistance program. Accordingly, I was pleased with the action of the committee in recommending the authorization of \$40 million in additional contractual authority for each of these programs. I am only disappointed that the full \$50 million requested by both the past and the present administrations was not granted. I am hopeful however that the Senate will approve the full request for these urgently needed funds.

As one of the original sponsors of the legislation to create the Redwood National Park in California, I am appreciative of the promptness with which the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, under the able leadership of Chairwoman JULIA HANSEN, has acted in appropriating funds for this park. This bill authorizes the expenditure of another \$19 million to complete the purchase of lands obtained by the Government under a decree of legislative taking. The previous appropriation earlier this year, together with the funds provided in this bill, bring to \$72 million the amounts available for the purchase of the park in the very first year after its creation. I am warmly supportive of the appropriation of these funds, and am deeply pained that other objectionable provisions of the bill prevent me from supporting the entire measure.

I have today at some length attempted to explain to the Members of this body the evils I see in the expenditure limitation which is provided in this bill. In a nutshell, it is my fear that—while this limitation appears on its face not to reduce domestic expenditures below the levels requested in the budget—it will have the result of requiring enormous reductions in social spending to make up for underestimates of noncontrollable spending, like the interest on the public

debt. I am not willing to lend my support to this action which has the potential to gut the urgently needed and presently underfunded programs for health, education, housing, job training, pollution control, and antipoverty efforts.

Mr. Chairman, we have today heard many very thoughtful statements on the situation in Vietnam. I have for several years closely followed the tragic events in that tragic far away country. I have witnessed for the past 2 dozen months the growing revulsion with the war by the American and Vietnamese people. And throughout the same period I have witnessed small changes in the allied conduct of that war in the effort to wind down the conflict and find a stable peace. However, I have witnessed no new and major allied policy changes. Earlier this year I urged the President and his advisers to not only attach larger importance to the urgency of finding a solution in Vietnam, but to conduct a thorough review of our policy objectives with regard to the war and the settlement which would be acceptable to us. President Nixon in his recent statement offered to take some steps toward troop withdrawal and the recognition of a coalition government. But the conditions attached to these statements indicate that we have not yet conducted a thorough rethinking of our position in Vietnam. Accordingly, I am troubled today by this bill which appropriates funds to support continued fighting at current levels.

I am troubled too by amendments which have been adopted today which augur for a greater Federal involvement in the troubles of our colleges. As the representative in Congress of one of the most troubled of these communities, I can say that it is my considered judgment that in all but the most extreme circumstances it is best to leave the university problems to the university. Only when violence exceeds the capability of the local authorities is there any appropriate role for Federal intervention—and then only as a mediator, conciliator, and factfinder.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I have weighed the virtues and shortcomings of this bill, and I have found it lacking in sufficient merit to overcome the substantial dangers it opens up.

I urge the defeat of this bill.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry

amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Scherle amendment to page 15, at the end of line 6.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 15, at the end of line 6, strike the period and insert the following: "Provided further, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by PL 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 329, nays 61, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—329

Abbitt	Caffery	Fish
Abernethy	Camp	Fisher
Adair	Carter	Flood
Addabbo	Casey	Flowers
Albert	Cederberg	Flynt
Alexander	Chamberlain	Ford, Gerald R.
Anderson, Ill.	Chappell	Ford,
Anderson, Tenn.	Clancy	William D.
Andrews, Ala.	Clausen,	Foreman
Andrews,	Don H.	Fountain
N. Dak.	Clawson, Del.	Friedel
Annunzio	Cleveland	Fulton, Pa.
Arends	Collier	Fulton, Tenn.
Ashbrook	Collins	Fuqua
Aspinall	Colmer	Galifianakis
Ayres	Conable	Garmatz
Baring	Conte	Gaydos
Barrett	Corbett	Gettys
Beall, Md.	Coughlin	Gialmo
Belcher	Cramer	Gibbons
Beil, Calif.	Cunningham	Goldwater
Bennett	Daniel, Va.	Gonzalez
Berry	Daniels, N.J.	Goodling
Betts	Davis, Ga.	Gray
Bevill	Davis, Wis.	Green, Oreg.
Biaggi	de la Garza	Griffin
Blester	Delaney	Griffiths
Blackburn	Dellenback	Gross
Blanton	Denney	Grover
Boggs	Dennis	Gubser
Boland	Derwinski	Gude
Bow	Devine	Hagan
Bray	Dickinson	Haley
Brinkley	Dingell	Hall
Brock	Donohue	Halpern
Brooks	Dowdy	Hamilton
Broomfield	Downing	Hammer-
Brotzman	Dulski	schmidt
Brown, Mich.	Duncan	Hanley
Brown, Ohio	Dwyer	Hansen, Idaho
Broyhill, N.C.	Edmondson	Hansen, Wash.
Broyhill, Va.	Edwards, Ala.	Harsha
Buchanan	Eilberg	Harvey
Burke, Fla.	Erlenborn	Hays
Burke, Mass.	Esch	Hechler, W. Va.
Burleson, Tex.	Eshleman	Heckler, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.	Evans, Colo.	Henderson
Bush	Evins, Tenn.	Hicks
Byrne, Pa.	Fallon	Horton
Byrnes, Wis.	Fascell	Hosmer
Cabell	Feighan	Hull
	Findley	Hungate

Hunt	Morton	Smith, Calif.
Hutchinson	Mosher	Smith, Iowa
Ichord	Murphy, Ill.	Snyder
Jacobs	Myers	Springer
Jarman	Natcher	Stafford
Joelson	Nedzi	Staggers
Johnson, Calif.	Nelsen	Stanton
Johnson, Pa.	Nichols	Steed
Jonas	Obey	Steiger, Ariz.
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Steiger, Wis.
Jones, N.C.	Olsen	Stephens
Jones, Tenn.	O'Neal, Ga.	Stratton
Karth	O'Neill, Mass.	Stubblefield
Kazen	Passman	Stuckey
Kee	Patman	Sullivan
Keith	Pelly	Symington
King	Pepper	Taft
Kleppe	Perkins	Talcott
Kluczynski	Pettis	Taylor
Kyl	Philbin	Teague, Calif.
Kyros	Pickle	Teague, Tex.
Landgrebe	Pike	Thompson, Ga.
Landrum	Pirnie	Thomson, Wis.
Langen	Poage	Tierman
Latta	Poff	Tunney
Lennon	Preyer, N.C.	Udall
Lipscomb	Price, Ill.	Ullman
Lloyd	Price, Tex.	Utt
Long, La.	Pryor, Ark.	Van Deerlin
Long, Md.	Pucinski	Vanik
Lukens	Purcell	Vigorito
McClory	Quie	Waggonner
McClure	Quillen	Wampler
McCulloch	Rarick	Watkins
McDade	Reid, Ill.	Watson
McDonald,	Rhodes	Watts
Mich.	Rivers	Weicker
McEwen	Roberts	Whalen
McFall	Robison	Whalley
McKneally	Rogers, Colo.	White
Macdonald,	Rogers, Fla.	Whitehurst
Mass.	Ronan	Whitten
Madden	Rooney, N.Y.	Widnall
Mahon	Rooney, Pa.	Williams
Mailliard	Rostenkowski	Wilson, Bob
Mann	Roth	Wilson,
Marsh	Roudebush	Charles H.
Martin	Ruth	Winn
Mathias	St Germain	Wold
May	Satterfield	Wright
Meeds	Saylor	Wyatt
Michel	Schadeberg	Wydler
Miller, Calif.	Scherle	Wylie
Miller, Ohio	Schneebeli	Wyman
Mills	Schwengel	Yatron
Minshall	Scott	Young
Mize	Sebelius	Zablocki
Mizell	Shriver	Zion
Mollohan	Sikes	Zwack
Monagan	Sisk	
Montgomery	Slack	

NAYS—61

Adams	Farbstein	Moorhead
Anderson,	Foley	Moss
Calif.	Fraser	Nix
Ashley	Frelinghuysen	O'Hara
Bingham	Gallagher	Ottinger
Bolling	Gilbert	Patten
Brademas	Green, Pa.	Podell
Brasco	Hanna	Powell
Brown, Calif.	Hathaway	Rees
Burton, Calif.	Hawkins	Reid, N.Y.
Button	Holifield	Reuss
Celler	Kastenmeier	Rosenthal
Chisholm	Koch	Roybal
Clay	Leggett	Ryan
Cohelan	Lowenstein	St. Onge
Conyers	McCarthy	Stokes
Corman	Matsunaga	Thompson, N.J.
Daddario	Mayne	Waldie
Diggs	Mikva	Wolff
Eckhardt	Minish	Yates
Edwards, Calif.	Mink	

NOT VOTING—43

Bates	Helstoski	Randall
Blatnik	Hogan	Reifel
Burton, Utah	Howard	Riegle
Cahill	Kirwan	Rodino
Carey	Kuykendall	Rumsfeld
Clark	Lujan	Ruppe
Cowger	McCloskey	Sandman
Culver	McMillan	Scheuer
Dawson	MacGregor	Shipley
Dent	Meskill	Skubitz
Dorn	Morgan	Smith, N.Y.
Edwards, La.	Morse	Vander Jagt
Frey	Murphy, N.Y.	Wiggins
Hastings	Pollock	
Hébert	Railsback	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Scheuer against.
Mr. Dorn for, with Mr. Carey against.
Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Dawson against.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana for, with Mr. Helstoski against.
Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Murphy of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rodino with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Clark with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Hogan with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Burton of Utah with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Vander Jagt with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Pollock with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Reifel with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. MacGregor with Mr. Kuykendall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CEDERBERG moves to recommit the bill H.R. 11400 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 347, nays 40, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—347

Abbott	Berry	Buchanan
Abernethy	Betts	Burke, Fla.
Adair	Bevill	Burke, Mass.
Adams	Biaggi	Burleson, Tex.
Addabbo	Blester	Burlison, Mo.
Albert	Blackburn	Bush
Alexander	Blanton	Button
Anderson, Ill.	Blatnik	Byrne, Pa.
Anderson, Tenn.	Boggs	Byrnes, Wis.
Andrews, Ala.	Boland	Cabell
Andrews, N. Dak.	Bolling	Caffery
Annuizio	Bow	Camp
Arends	Brademas	Carter
Ashley	Brasco	Casey
Aspinall	Bray	Chamberlain
Ayres	Brinkley	Chappell
Baring	Brock	Clausen
Barrett	Brooks	Don H.
Beall, Md.	Broomfield	Clawson, Del.
Belcher	Brotzman	Cleveland
Bell, Calif.	Brown, Mich.	Collier
Bennett	Brown, Ohio	Collins
	Broyhill, N.C.	Colmer
	Broyhill, Va.	

Conable	Ichord	Quie
Conte	Jacobs	Rarick
Corbett	Jarman	Reid, Ill.
Corman	Joelsson	Reid, N.Y.
Coughlin	Johnson, Calif.	Reuss
Cramer	Johnson, Pa.	Rhodes
Cunningham	Jonas	Roberts
Daddario	Jones, Ala.	Robison
Daniel, Va.	Jones, N.C.	Rogers, Colo.
Daniels, N.J.	Jones, Tenn.	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Ga.	Karth	Ronan
Davis, Wis.	Kazen	Rooney, Pa.
de la Garza	Kee	Rostenkowski
Delaney	Keith	Roth
Dellenback	King	Roudebush
Denney	Kleppe	Roybal
Dennis	Kluczynski	Ruth
Derwinski	Kyros	St Germain
Devine	Landgrebe	St. Onge
Dickinson	Landrum	Satterfield
Dingell	Langen	Saylor
Donohue	Leggett	Schadeberg
Dowdy	Lennon	Scherle
Downing	Lipscomb	Schwengel
Dulski	Lloyd	Scott
Duncan	Long, La.	Sebelius
Dwyer	Long, Md.	Shriver
Eckhardt	Lukens	Sikes
Edmondson	McCarthy	Sisk
Edwards, Ala.	McClary	Slack
Eilberg	McClure	Smith, Calif.
Erlenborn	McCulloch	Smith, Iowa
Esch	McDade	Snyder
Eshleman	McDonald, Mich.	Springer
Evans, Colo.	McEwen	Stafford
Evins, Tenn.	McFall	Staggers
Fallon	McKneally	Stanton
Fascell	Macdonald, Mass.	Steed
Feighan	Madden	Steiger, Ariz.
Fish	Mahon	Steiger, Wis.
Fisher	Mailliard	Stephens
Flood	Mann	Stratton
Flowers	Marsh	Stubblefield
Flynt	Martin	Stuckey
Foley	Mathias	Sullivan
Ford, Gerald R.	Matsunaga	Symington
Ford, William D.	May	Taft
Foreman	Mayne	Talcott
Fountain	Meeds	Taylor
Frelinghuysen	Michel	Teague, Calif.
Friedel	Miller, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Fulton, Pa.	Mills	Thompson, Ga.
Fulton, Tenn.	Minish	Thompson, N.J.
Fuqua	Mink	Thomson, Wis.
Galifianakis	Minshall	Tiernan
Gallagher	Mize	Tunney
Garmatz	Mizell	Udall
Gaydos	Mollohan	Ullman
Gettys	Monagan	Utt
Gialino	Montgomery	Van Deerlin
Gibbons	Moorhead	Vander Jagt
Goldwater	Morton	Vigorito
Gonzalez	Moss	Waggoner
Goodling	Murphy, Ill.	Waldie
Gray	Myers	Wampler
Green, Oreg.	Natcher	Watkins
Green, Pa.	Nedzi	Watson
Griffin	Nichols	Weicker
Griffiths	Nix	Whalen
Grover	Obey	Whalley
Gubser	O'Hara	White
Gude	O'Konski	Whitehurst
Hagan	Olsen	Whitten
Halpern	O'Neal, Ga.	Williams
Hamilton	O'Neill, Mass.	Wilson, Bob
Hammer	Passman	Wilson, Charles H.
schmidt	Patman	Winn
Hanley	Patten	Wold
Hanna	Pelly	Wolff
Hansen, Idaho	Pepper	Wright
Hansen, Wash.	Perkins	Wyatt
Harvey	Pettis	Wydler
Hathaway	Philbin	Wylie
Hays	Pickle	Wyman
Hechler, W. Va.	Pike	Yates
Heckler, Mass.	Pirnie	Yatron
Henderson	Poage	Young
Hicks	Poff	Zablocki
Holifield	Preyer, N.C.	Zion
Horton	Price, Ill.	Zwach
Hosmer	Price, Tex.	
Hull	Pryor, Ark.	
Hungate	Pucinski	
Hunt	Purcell	
Hutchinson		

NAYS—40

Anderson, Calif.	Clancy	Gilbert
Ashbrook	Clay	Gross
Bingham	Cohelan	Haley
Brown, Calif.	Conyers	Hall
Burton, Calif.	Diggs	Harsha
Cederberg	Edwards, Calif.	Hawkins
Chisholm	Farbstein	Kastenmeier
	Fraser	Koch

Kyl
Latta
Lowenstein
Mikva
Miller, Ohio
Mosher

Ottlinger
Podell
Powell
Quillen
Rees
Rosenthal

Ruppe
Ryan
Schneebeli
Stokes
Vanik

NOT VOTING—46

Bates
Burton, Utah
Cahill
Carey
Clark
Cowger
Culver
Dawson
Dent
Dorn
Edwards, La.
Findley
Frey
Hastings
Hébert
Helstoski

Hogan
Howard
Kirwan
Kuykendall
Lujan
McCloskey
McMillan
MacGregor
Meskill
Morgan
Morse
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
Pollock
Railsback
Randall

Reifel
Riegle
Rivers
Rodino
Rooney, N.Y.
Rumsfeld
Sandman
Scheuer
Shipley
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Watts
Widnall
Wiggins

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Morse.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Reifel.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Rumsfeld.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Skubitz.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Bates.
Mr. Randall with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Smith of New York with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Pollock with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Hastings.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the bill may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks, and insert certain tabular material and pertinent extracts otherwise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 58 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 23, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
5 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second
6 Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

1 TITLE I

2 MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

3 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

4 MILITARY PERSONNEL

5 MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

6 For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
7 Army”, \$110,000,000.

8 MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

9 For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
10 Navy”, \$14,500,000.

11 MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

12 For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
13 Air Force”, \$115,000,000.

14 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

15 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

16 For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
17 tenance, Army”, \$96,310,000.

18 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

19 For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
20 tenance, Marine Corps”, \$15,390,000.

21 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

22 For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
23 tenance, Air Force”, \$242,700,000.

1 PROCUREMENT

2 PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES, ARMY

3 For an additional amount for "Procurement of equip-
4 ment and missiles, Army", \$640,100,000, to remain avail-
5 able until expended.

6 TITLE II

7 CHAPTER I

8 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

9 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
12 for "Plant and animal disease and pest control", \$1,400,000.

13 EXTENSION SERVICE

14 COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES

15 For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension
16 work, payments and expenses", for "Retirement and employ-
17 ees' compensation costs for extension agents", \$218,000.

18 AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION

19 SERVICE

20 SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

21 For an additional amount for "Sugar Act program",
22 \$7,500,000.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

There may be transferred to the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund not to exceed \$25,000,000 of the unobligated funds in the Direct Loan Account, to be reimbursed to the Direct Loan Account from repayments of loans made from the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Reserve personnel, Navy”, \$4,150,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Reserve personnel, Marine Corps”, \$4,500,000.

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for “Retired pay, Defense”, \$175,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Operation and maintenance, Navy”, \$20,000,000.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

2 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
3 nance, Marine Corps", \$3,600,000.

4 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

5 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
6 nance, Army National Guard", \$10,000,000.

7 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

8 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
9 nance, Air National Guard", \$8,800,000.

10 GENERAL PROVISION

11 SEC. 201. Deficiencies incurred under the terms of sec-
12 tion 3732 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C.
13 11), shall not exceed the amounts of the estimates in House
14 Documents Numbered 91-50 and 91-94, or the amounts
15 provided herein, whichever is lower, for each such author-
16 ized purpose.

17 CHAPTER III

18 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

19 FEDERAL FUNDS

20 FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

21 For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the
22 District of Columbia", for the general fund of the District
23 of Columbia, \$10,365,000.

1 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

2 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

3 For an additional amount for "General operating ex-
4 penses", \$975,000, of which \$1,000 shall be payable from
5 the highway fund.

6 PUBLIC SAFETY

7 For an additional amount for "Public safety", \$10,034,-
8 000, of which \$528,000 shall be payable from the highway
9 fund, and of which \$1,302,000 shall be available for the fiscal
10 year 1968.

11 EDUCATION

12 For an additional amount for "Education", \$13,931,000.

13 HEALTH AND WELFARE

14 For an additional amount for "Health and welfare",
15 \$111,000.

16 SANITARY ENGINEERING

17 For an additional amount for "Sanitary engineering",
18 \$252,000.

19 SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

20 For payment of claims in excess of \$250, approved by
21 the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of the
22 Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46
23 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$50,000.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated herein for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

For an additional amount for "Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$2,700,000, and, in addition, \$35,000 which shall be derived by transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER V

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, telecommunications", \$500,000, to remain available until expended.

1 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

2 DISASTER RELIEF

3 For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", \$35,-
4 000,000, to remain available until expended.

5 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

6 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
9 \$600,000; (and release of \$81,000 reserved under this
10 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
11 364).

12 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
15 \$2,573,000.

16 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

17 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

18 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
19 sions", \$179,000,000, to remain available until expended.

20 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

21 For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits",
22 \$14,200,000, to remain available until expended.

23 MEDICAL CARE

24 For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$46,189,-
25 000: (and release of \$15,167,000 reserved under this ap-
26 propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$12,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

MORTGAGE CREDIT

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat. 477), is increased by \$40,000,000 and the limitation on total payments under those entered into under section 236 of such Act (82 Stat. 498) is increased by \$40,000,000.

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

COLLEGE HOUSING

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with educational institutions entered into pursuant to section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604), is increased by \$2,500,000.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For additional amounts for "Low rent public housing annual contributions", \$7,168,000 for the fiscal year 1968, and \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$10,410,000; and in addition, \$1,803,000 (including \$175,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Water supply and water pollution control", fiscal year 1969; (and release of \$275,000 reserved under "Management of lands and resources" pursuant to said section 201).

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", \$2,769,000; (and release of \$426,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For a repayable advance to the "Land and water conservation fund", as authorized by section 4 (b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16

1 U.S.C. 4601-7), for liquidation of obligations incurred
2 against such fund pursuant to law, \$19,000,000, to remain
3 available until expended.

4 For an additional amount for "Land and water conser-
5 vation", to be derived from the "Land and water conserva-
6 tion fund" and to remain available until expended for liqui-
7 dation of obligations incurred pursuant to section 3 (b) (1)
8 of the Act of October 2, 1968 (Public Law 90-545), \$19,-
9 000,000.

10 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

11 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

12 For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations,
13 and research", \$2,092,000, of which \$300,000 shall remain
14 available until June 30, 1970.

15 BUREAU OF MINES

16 HELIUM FUND

17 For an additional amount of borrowing authority for
18 the "Helium fund", \$5,000,000, to remain available with-
19 out fiscal year limitation.

20 OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
23 \$48,000.

1 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

2 PAYMENT TO FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND

3 For payment to "Fishermen's Protective Fund", estab-
4 lished pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1968 (82 Stat.
5 729), \$60,000, to remain available until expended.

6 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

7 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

8 For an additional amount for "Management and investi-
9 gations of resources", \$1,353,000; (and release of \$139,000
10 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
11 of Public Law 90-364).

12 CONSTRUCTION

13 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$200,000,
14 to remain available until expended.

15 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

16 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

17 For an additional amount for "Management and pro-
18 tection", \$2,479,000; (and release of \$195,000 reserved
19 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
20 Law 90-364).

1 CONSTRUCTION

2 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$100,000,
3 to remain available until expended.

4 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

5 FOREST SERVICE

6 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

7 For an additional amount for "Forest protection and
8 utilization", as follows: "Forest land management", \$25,-
9 028,000; "Forest research", \$1,564,000; and "State and
10 private forestry cooperation", \$124,000: (and release of
11 \$1,676,000 reserved under "Forest protection and utiliza-
12 tion" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

13 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE

14 HUMANITIES

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
17 equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of
18 money, and other property received by each Endowment
19 under the provisions of section 10 (a) (2) of the National
20 Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965,

1 as amended, not to exceed a total of \$3,000,000, to remain
2 available until expended.

3 CHAPTER VII

4 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

5 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

6 UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL

7 EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

8 For an additional amount for "Unemployment com-
9 pensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen",
10 \$20,000,000.

11 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

12 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

13 EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION CLAIMS AND EXPENSES

14 For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation
15 claims and expenses", \$15,900,000.

16 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND

17 WELFARE

18 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

19 HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

20 For an additional amount for "Higher educational ac-
21 tivities", including payments authorized by section 108
22 (b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as
23 amended (Public Law 90-354, approved June 20, 1968),
24 and annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the
25 Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law

1 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), \$11,161,000, of
2 which \$3,920,000 shall remain available until expended for
3 said annual interest grants: *Provided*, That, in addition,
4 \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Community
5 mental health resource support", Public Health Service,
6 fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds
7 appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized
8 by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as
9 amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formulate
10 or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education
11 unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504
12 of such Act.

13 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

14 OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

15 COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES

16 For an additional amount for "Comprehensive health
17 planning and services", \$9,186,000, to be derived by trans-
18 fer from "Community mental health resource support",
19 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
20 \$292,000 reserved under "Comprehensive health planning
21 and services" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
22 364): *Provided*, That the amount made available under
23 "Comprehensive health planning and services" in the De-
24 partment of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation

1 Act, 1969, for grants under section 314(a) of the Public
 2 Health Service Act is reduced from “\$7,375,000” to
 3 \$7,125,000.

4 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

5 For grants and loans pursuant to the District of Columbia
 6 Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-
 7 457), \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

8 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

9 GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

10 For an additional amount for “Grants to States for
 11 maintenance payments”; “Grants to States for medical assist-
 12 ance”; and “Social services, administration, training, and
 13 demonstration projects”; \$651,546,000.

14 ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES NATIONALS

15 For an additional amount for “Assistance for repatriated
 16 United States nationals”, \$100,000.

17 CHAPTER VIII

18 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

19 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

20 For payment to Lelia Ashton Everett, mother of Robert
 21 A. Everett, late a Representative from the State of Ten-
 22 nessee, \$30,000.

23 CONTINGENT EXPENSES

24 Miscellaneous items: The limitation under this head,
 25 fiscal year 1969, on the payment to the Architect of the Capi-

1 tol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved Octo-
 2 ber 9, 1940 (Public Law 812), is hereby increased by
 3 \$36,000.

4 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

5 House office buildings: From and after March 1, 1969,
 6 the compensation of the Superintendent of Garages shall be
 7 at the basic annual rate of \$5,270.

8 CHAPTER IX

9 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

10 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

12 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
 13 general administration", \$65,000, and, in addition, \$231,-
 14 000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount
 15 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement
 16 Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public
 17 Law 90-364, and \$2,000 which shall be derived by transfer
 18 from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses,
 19 Community Relations Service", pursuant to said section 201.

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

21 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
 22 general legal activities", \$1,314,000, and, in addition, \$100,-
 23 000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount
 24 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement

1 Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public
2 Law 90-364; (and release of \$100,000 reserved under
3 "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities" pursuant to
4 said section 201).

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

6 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
7 Antitrust Division", \$99,000, and, in addition, \$262,000
8 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved
9 under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance
10 Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
11 364; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under "Salaries and
12 expenses, Antitrust Division" pursuant to said section 201).

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

14 AND MARSHALS

15 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
16 United States attorneys and marshals", \$2,505,000; (and
17 release of \$150,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
18 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

19 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

21 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
22 Bureau of Prisons", \$2,319,000; (and release of \$250,000
23 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
24 of Public Law 90-364).

1 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

2 For an additional amount for "Support of United States
3 Prisoners", \$2,500,000.

4 BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
7 \$1,187,000; (and release of \$400,000 reserved under this
8 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
9 90-364).

10 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

11 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

12 OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

13 The amount required to be advanced from "Operations
14 and administration" to the Small Business Administration
15 during the current fiscal year for the processing of loan appli-
16 cations is hereby reduced to \$1,200,000; (and release of
17 \$116,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
18 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364).

19 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

20 STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

21 For an additional amount for "State marine schools",
22 for liquidation of obligations incurred for payment of allow-
23 ances for uniforms, textbooks and subsistence of cadets at
24 State marine schools, to remain available until expended,

1 \$210,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
2 for "Ship construction".

3 THE JUDICIARY

4 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

5 PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

6 For an additional amount for "Printing and binding
7 Supreme Court reports", \$27,000.

8 For an additional amount for "Printing and binding
9 Supreme Court reports", fiscal year 1968, \$10,000.

10 CUSTOMS COURT

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
13 \$113,000.

14 COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

15 JUDICIAL SERVICES

16 SALARIES OF JUDGES

17 For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges",
18 \$1,975,000.

19 SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

20 For an additional amount for "Salaries of supporting
21 personnel", \$2,412,000.

22 TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

23 For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous
24 expenses", \$400,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of the United States Courts", \$97,500, and, in addition, \$10,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Expenses of referees", fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$298,000; (and release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$2,000,000.

CHAPTER XI

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$1,978,000; (and release of \$334,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

2 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
5 \$107,000.

6 NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
9 \$200,000.

10 CHAPTER XII

11 CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

12 For payment of claims settled and determined by depart-
13 ments and agencies in accord with law and judgments ren-
14 dered against the United States by the United States Court
15 of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in
16 House Document Numbered 101, Ninety-first Congress,
17 \$16,880,812, together with such amounts as may be neces-
18 sary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judg-
19 ments or provided by law) and such additional sums due
20 to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to
21 pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judg-
22 ment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall be-
23 come final and conclusive against the United States by
24 failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided fur-*
25 *ther*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or

by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for
herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after
the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE III

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal
year 1969, for increased pay costs authorized by or pur-
suant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

Compensation of Members, \$1,975,000;

SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

“Office of the Speaker”, \$4,015;

“Office of the Parliamentarian”, \$12,935;

“Compilation of precedents of House of Representa-
tives”, \$670;

“Office of the Chaplain”, \$1,250;

“Office of the Clerk”, \$110,000;

“Office of the Sergeant at Arms”, \$192,000;

“Office of the Doorkeeper”, \$65,000;

“Office of the Postmaster”, \$40,875;

“Committee employees”, \$400,000;

Special and minority employees:

- 1 "Minority employees", \$11,410;
- 2 "House Democratic steering committee", \$3,760;
- 3 "House Republican conference", \$3,760;
- 4 "Majority leader", \$4,800;
- 5 "Minority leader", \$4,005;
- 6 "Majority whip", \$3,885;
- 7 "Minority whip", \$3,885;
- 8 "Printing clerks", \$980;
- 9 "Official reporters of debates", \$27,000;
- 10 "Official reporters to committees", \$24,760;
- 11 "Office of the legislative counsel", \$25,600;

12 MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE

- 13 "Members' clerk hire", \$3,050,000;

14 Contingent Expenses of the House

- 15 "Special and select committees", \$129,000;
- 16 "Revision of laws", \$1,490;
- 17 "Speaker's automobile", \$665;
- 18 "Majority leader's automobile", \$665;
- 19 "Minority leader's automobile", \$665;

20 JOINT ITEMS

21 Contingent Expenses of the Senate

- 22 "Joint Economic Committee", \$13,500;
- 23 "Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", \$17,820;
- 24 "Joint Committee on Printing", \$12,425;

25 Contingent Expenses of the House

1 “Joint Committee on Defense Production”, \$7,950;

2 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

3 Office of the Architect of the Capitol: “Salaries”,

4 \$36,000;

5 Capitol buildings and grounds:

6 “Capitol buildings”, \$74,500;

7 “Capitol grounds”, \$25,600;

8 “House office buildings”, \$300,000;

9 “Capitol power plant”, \$27,500;

10 Library buildings and grounds: “Structural and me-
11 chanical care”, \$28,000;

12 BOTANIC GARDEN

13 “Salaries and expenses”, \$22,500;

14 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$579,300: *Provided*, That
16 \$75,000 of the amount allocated for rental of space under
17 this head, fiscal year 1969, may be used for increased pay
18 costs;

19 Copyright Office: “Salaries and expenses”, \$109,800;

20 Legislative Reference Service: “Salaries and expenses”,
21 \$170,000, and in addition, \$50,000 to be derived by trans-
22 fer from the appropriation “Salaries and expenses”, distri-
23 bution of catalog cards;

24 Distribution of catalog cards: Not to exceed \$150,000

1 of the \$200,000 reserve fund under this head, fiscal year
2 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

3 Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presi-
4 dents: "Salaries and expenses", \$6,000;

5 "Collection and distribution of library materials (spe-
6 cial foreign currency program) ", \$9,000;

7 GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

8 Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and
9 expenses", \$178,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,-
10 000 of the \$200,000 reserve fund under this head, fiscal
11 year 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

12 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,214,000;

14 THE JUDICIARY

15 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

16 "Salaries", \$120,000;

17 "Care of the building and grounds", \$15,900;

18 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$16,000;

20 COURT OF CLAIMS

21 "Salaries and expenses", \$64,000;

22 COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

23 JUDICIAL SERVICES

24 "Expenses of referees", \$248,000, to be derived from
25 the "Referees' salary and expense fund";

1 "Salaries of referees", \$404,000, to be derived from the
2 "Referees' salary and expense fund";

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

4 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

5 For an additional amount for "Compensation of the
6 President", \$44,584;

7 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$50,000; (and release of
9 \$355,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
10 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$100,000; (and release of
13 \$70,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
14 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

15 "Salaries and expenses, Telecommunications"; (Release
16 of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
17 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

18 "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Fed-
19 eral agencies", \$30,000; (and release of \$40,000 reserved
20 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
21 Law 90-364) ;

22 OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

23 "Salaries and expenses", (Release of \$28,000 reserved
24 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
25 Law 90-364) ;

1 SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$32,000;

3 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

4 "Administrative expenses", Agency for International
5 Development, \$1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from
6 appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1969;7 "Administrative and other expenses", Department of
8 State, \$75,000, to be derived by transfer from appropria-
9 tions for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1969;

10 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

11 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

12 "Salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$6,615,000 re-
13 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
14 Public Law 90-364) ;

15 COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

16 "Payments and expenses"; (Release of \$81,000 re-
17 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
18 Public Law 90-364) ;

19 FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

20 "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses";
21 (Release of \$135,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
22 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

23 FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$73,000;

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

“Conservation operations”, \$3,980,000; (and release of \$1,000,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Watershed planning”, \$254,000; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“River basin surveys and investigations”, \$306,000; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Watershed works of improvement”, \$688,000; (and release of \$300,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Flood prevention”, \$224,000; (and release of \$128,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Great Plains conservation program”, \$160,000;

“Resource conservation and development”, \$111,000; (and release of \$100,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$684,000;

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$527,000;

1 CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

2 “Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory pro-
3 grams”, \$2,300,000; (and release of \$600,000 reserved
4 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
5 Law 90-364) .

6 “Special milk program”; (Release of \$15,000 reserved
7 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
8 Law 90-364) ;

9 FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$362,000, to be derived by
11 transfer from “Cropland adjustment program”, Agricultural
12 Stabilization and Conservation Service, fiscal year 1969;
13 (and release of \$68,000 reserved under “Salaries and ex-
14 penses”, Foreign Agricultural Service, pursuant to section
15 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$65,000;

18 AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION
19 SERVICE

20 “Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation
21 Service”, \$4,108,000 of which \$1,826,000 shall be derived
22 by transfer from “Cropland adjustment program”, fiscal year
23 1969, \$1,560,000, from “Cropland conversion program”,
24 and \$722,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation
25 Fund; (and release of \$551,000 reserved under “Expenses,

1 Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service", pur-
2 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

3 RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$18,000; (and release of
5 \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
6 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$568,000;

9 PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$49,000; (and release of
11 \$64,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
12 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

13 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$239,000;

15 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$58,000;

17 NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$40,000; (and release of
19 \$35,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
20 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

21 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$116,000; (and release of
23 \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
24 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$224,000, of which \$36,000
3 shall be derived by transfer from “Payments and expenses”,
4 Cooperative State Research Service, (and release of
5 \$30,000 reserved under “Salaries and expenses” pursuant
6 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$624,000; (and release of
9 \$11,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
10 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$2,094,000, of which \$13,000
13 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under
14 “Salaries and expenses”, Agricultural Research Service pur-
15 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, \$158,000 from
16 “Payments and expenses”, Cooperative State Research Serv-
17 ice (including \$44,000 from the amount reserved pursuant
18 to said section 201), \$2,000 from the amount reserved
19 under “Cooperative extension work, payments and ex-
20 penses”, Federal Extension Service pursuant to said section
21 201, \$150,000 from “Payments to States and possessions”,
22 Consumer and Marketing Service, and \$412,000 from “Crop-
23 land adjustment program”, Agricultural Stabilization and
24 Conservation Service; (and release of \$156,000 reserved

1 under "Salaries and expenses", Farmers Home Administra-
2 tion pursuant to said section 201) ;

3 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

4 "Administrative and operating expenses", \$274,000;
5 (and release of \$97,000 reserved under this appropriation
6 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

8 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$293,000, of which \$75,000
10 shall be derived by transfer from "Operations and adminis-
11 tration", Economic Development Assistance;

12 OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$75,000, to be derived by
14 transfer from "Operations and administration", Economic
15 Development Assistance; (and release of \$59,000 reserved
16 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
17 Law 90-364) ;

18 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$567,000;

20 "1967 economic censuses", \$285,000;

21 BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$206,000; (and release of
23 \$36,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
24 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$200,000; (and release of
3 \$163,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
4 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 “Export control”, \$136,000; (and release of \$60,000
6 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
7 Public Law 90-364) ;

8 OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

9 “Salaries and expenses”, \$142,000; (and release of
10 \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
11 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

13 “Salaries and expenses”, \$3,254,000; (and release of
14 \$786,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
15 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 “Research and development”, \$614,000; (and release
17 of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
18 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

19 PATENT OFFICE

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,240,000; (and release of
21 \$321,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
22 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

2 "Research and technical services", \$1,100,000;

3 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

4 "Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses,
5 \$261,000;6 "Maritime training", \$100,000; (and release of \$99,000
7 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
8 Public Law 90-364) ;

9 FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$173,000;

11 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

12 MILITARY PERSONNEL

13 "Military personnel, Army", \$230,000,000;

14 "Military personnel, Navy", \$160,000,000;

15 "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$45,000,000;

16 "Military personnel, Air Force", \$214,000,000;

17 "National Guard personnel, Army", \$13,000,000;

18 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

19 "Operation and maintenance, Army", \$85,000,000;

20 "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$73,000,000;

21 "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies",
22 \$32,000,000;

1 “Court of Military Appeals”, \$18,000;

2 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

3 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

4 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

5 “Operation and maintenance, general”, \$1,731,000, and
6 in addition, \$1,869,000, to be derived by transfer from the
7 amount reserved under “Construction general”, pursuant to
8 section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

9 “General expenses”, \$1,000,000, to be derived by trans-
10 fer from the amount reserved under “Construction, general”,
11 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364.

12 UNITED STATES SOLDIERS’ HOME

13 “Operation and maintenance”; (Release of \$181,000
14 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
15 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 THE PANAMA CANAL

17 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

18 “Operating expenses”, \$1,085,000 (and release of
19 \$120,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
20 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

21 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND

22 “Limitation on general and administrative expenses”,
23 (increase of \$130,000 in the limitation on administrative

1 expenses and release of \$20,000 reserved under this limita-
2 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

3 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
4 WELFARE

5 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,589,000, to be derived by
7 transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Serv-
8 ice, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$835,000 reserved
9 under "Salaries and expenses", Food and Drug Administra-
10 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) :

11 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

12 "School assistance in federally affected areas", \$16,000,
13 to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health
14 resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969:
15 (and release of \$12,000 reserved under "School assistance in
16 federally affected areas" pursuant to section 201 of Public
17 Law 90-364) ;

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$694,000, to be derived by
19 transfer from "Community mental health resource support",
20 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
21 \$1,123,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursu-
22 ant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

23 "Civil rights educational activities", \$67,000, to be

1 derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource
2 support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

3 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

4 OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

5 "Salaries and expenses", \$307,000, to be derived by
6 transfer from "Community mental health resource support",
7 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
8 \$80,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to
9 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

10 HEALTH MANPOWER

11 "Health manpower education and utilization"; (release
12 of \$201,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
13 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

14 "Dental health activities"; (release of \$102,000 re-
15 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
16 Public Law 90-364) ;

17 DISEASE PREVENTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

18 "Chronic diseases", \$436,000, to be derived by transfer
19 from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal
20 year 1969: (and release of \$130,000 reserved under
21 "Chronic diseases" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
22 90-364) ;

23 "Air pollution"; (release of \$519,000 reserved under
24 this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
25 90-364) ;

1 “Urban and industrial health”; (Release of \$492,000
2 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
3 Public Law 90-364) ;

4 “Radiological health”, \$407,000, to be derived by trans-
5 fer from “Community mental health resource support”, Pub-
6 lic Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

7 HEALTH SERVICES

8 “Community health services”; (release of \$590,000
9 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
10 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 “Patient care and special health services”, \$1,993,000,
12 to be derived by transfer from “Communicable diseases”,
13 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
14 \$91,000 reserved under “Patient care and special health
15 services” pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 “Hospital construction activities”; (release of \$169,000
17 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
18 Public Law 90-364) ;

19 “Indian health activities”, \$2,640,000, to be derived
20 by transfer from the amount reserved under “Communicable
21 diseases”, Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of
22 Public Law 90-364: (and release of \$214,000 reserved
23 under “Indian health activities” pursuant to said section
24 201) ;

1 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

2 “Biologics standards”; (Release of \$114,000 reserved
3 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
4 Law 90-364) ;

5 “Regional medical programs”; (Release of \$67,000
6 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
7 Public Law 90-364) ;

8 “Environmental health sciences”; (Release of \$137,000
9 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
10 Public Law 90-364) ;

11 NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

12 “Mental health research and services”, \$401,000, to
13 be derived by transfer from “Community mental health re-
14 source support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969:
15 (and release of \$801,000 reserved under “Mental health
16 research and services” pursuant to section 201 of Public
17 Law 90-364) ;

18 “Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Salaries and expenses”,
19 \$1,984,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community
20 mental health resource support”, Public Health Service,
21 fiscal year 1969;

22 OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

23 “National health statistics”; (Release of \$271,000 re-
24 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
25 Public Law 90-364) ;

1 "National Library of Medicine"; (Release of \$162,000
2 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
3 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

5 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,234,000, to be derived by
6 transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Serv-
7 ice, fiscal year 1969 ;

8 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

9 "Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund) ", (In-
10 crease of \$18,147,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and
11 expenses") ;

12 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

13 "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", \$56,000,
14 to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health
15 resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969 ;

16 "Howard University, salaries and expenses", \$401,000,
17 to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health
18 resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969 ;

19 "Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses", \$291,-
20 000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental
21 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
22 1969 ;

23 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$216,000, to be derived by
25 transfer from "Community mental health resource support",

1 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
2 \$232,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant
3 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 "Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses",
5 \$215,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community
6 mental health resource support", Public Health Service,
7 fiscal year 1969 ;

8 "Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses"; (Re-
9 lease of \$458,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant
10 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 "Office of Administration, salaries and expenses", \$233,-
12 000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental
13 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
14 1969: (and release of \$10,000 reserved under "Office of
15 Administration, salaries and expenses" pursuant to section
16 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

17 "Surplus property utilization", \$57,000, to be derived
18 by transfer from "Community mental health resource sup-
19 port", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969 ;

20 "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses",
21 \$56,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental
22 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
23 1969: (and release of \$61,000 reserved under "Office of the
24 General Counsel, salaries and expenses" pursuant to section
25 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

2 DEVELOPMENT

3 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,407,000; (and release of
5 \$387,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant
6 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$280,000; (and release of
9 \$73,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant
10 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$66,000; and, in addition,
13 \$171,000 (including \$34,000 reserved pursuant to section
14 201 of Public Law 90-364) to be derived by transfer from
15 "Model cities programs"; (and release of \$15,000 reserved
16 on account of "Salaries and expenses", Demonstrations and
17 Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to section 201 of
18 Public Law 90-364) ;

19 "Urban Research and Technology", (Release of \$6,000
20 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to sec-
21 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

22 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

23 "General administration", \$230,000; (and release of
24 \$51,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant
25 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 “Regional management and services”, \$278,000; (and
2 release of \$80,000 reserved on account of this appropriation
3 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 MORTGAGE CREDIT

5 “Limitation on administrative and non-administrative
6 expenses, Federal housing administration”; (Increase of
7 \$465,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and
8 increase of \$1,000,000 in the limitation on non-administra-
9 tive expenses) ;

10 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

11 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

12 “Education and welfare services”, \$2,843,000; (and
13 release of \$415,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
14 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

15 “Construction”, (Release of \$39,000 reserved under this
16 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
17 90-364) ;

18 “Road construction (liquidation of contract authoriza-
19 tion) ”, (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this appropria-
20 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

21 “General administrative expenses”, \$246,000, to be
22 derived by transfer from “Water supply and water pollution
23 control”, fiscal year 1969;

24 “Operation and maintenance, Indian irrigation systems”;
25 (Release of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
26 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 “Power systems, Indian irrigation projects”; (Release
2 of \$39,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
3 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 “Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, schools,
5 etc.”; (Release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation
6 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 “Tribal funds”; (Release of \$48,000 reserved under this
8 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
9 90-364) ;

10 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

11 “Salaries and expenses”, \$175,000;

12 BUREAU OF MINES

13 “Conservation and development of mineral resources”,
14 \$750,000; and \$433,000, to be derived by transfer from
15 “Solid waste disposal”;

16 “Health and safety”, \$347,000, to be derived by transfer
17 from “Solid waste disposal”;

18 “General administrative expenses”, \$70,000, to be
19 derived by transfer from “Solid waste disposal”;

20 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

21 “Management and investigations of resources”, \$628,-
22 000; (and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropria-
23 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

24 “Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and de-
25 velopment”, \$8,000;

1 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
2 \$7,000;

3 “General administrative expenses”, \$45,000;

4 “Administration of Pribilof Islands”, \$20,000;

5 “Promote and develop fishery products and research
6 pertaining to American fisheries”; (Release of \$10,000
7 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
8 Public Law 90-364) ;

9 “Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan
10 fund”, (Increase of \$13,000 in the limitation on adminis-
11 trative expenses) ;

12 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

13 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
14 \$9,000, which shall be derived by transfer from the amount
15 reserved under “Saline water conversion”, fiscal year 1969,
16 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

17 “General administrative expenses”, \$78,000; and in
18 addition \$4,000 to be derived by transfer from the amount
19 reserved under “Operation and maintenance”, Southwestern
20 Power Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public
21 Law 90-364;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

“Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities”,
\$668,000; (and release of \$115,000 reserved under this ap-
propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“General administrative expenses”, \$186,000;

“Preservation of historic properties”, \$21,000;

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

“General investigations”, \$371,000;

“Operation and maintenance”, \$630,000;

“General administrative expenses”, \$450,000;

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

“Construction”; (Release of \$998,000 reserved under
this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
90-364) ;

“Operation and maintenance”; (Release of \$643,000
reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
Public Law 90-364) ;

“Construction of electric transmission lines and substa-
tions, contributions, Bonneville Power Project”; (Release of
\$1,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$298,000;

3 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4 “Salaries and expenses”, \$454,000;

5 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$31,000;

7 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

8 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

9 “Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service”;

10 (Release of \$88,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
11 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

13 “Salaries and expenses”, \$9,220,000;

14 IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$3,276,000; (and release of
16 \$270,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
17 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

18 LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

19 “Salaries and expenses”; (Release of \$57,000 reserved
20 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
21 Law 90-364) ;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

“Manpower Development and Training Activities”;

(Release of \$92,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses”; (Release of \$313,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses”, \$363,000, of which \$213,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; \$142,000 by transfer from the amount reserved under “Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to said section 201, and \$8,000, by transfer from the amount reserved under “Manpower Development and Training Activities”, pursuant to said section 201; (and release of \$50,000 reserved under “Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to said section 201) ;

“Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and ex-

1 penses", (Increase of \$865,000 in the amount available for
2 administrative expenses and release of \$125,000 reserved
3 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
4 Law 90-364) ;

5 LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

6 "Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries
7 and expenses", (Release of \$448,000 reserved under this
8 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
9 364) ;

10 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

11 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$152,000, of which \$100,000
13 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under
14 "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant
15 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, and \$52,000 by trans-
16 fer from the amount reserved under "Labor Management
17 Services Administration, salaries and expenses", pursuant to
18 section 201; (and release of \$120,000 reserved under "Wage
19 and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses".
20 pursuant to said section 201) ;

21 "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses";
22 (Release of \$992,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
23 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

24 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

25 "Salaries and expenses", \$180,000, of which \$87,000
26 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under

1 “Office of the Manpower Administrator, salaries and ex-
2 penses”, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;
3 (and release of \$700,000 reserved under “Bureau of Labor
4 Statistics, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to said section
5 201) ;

6 BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

7 “Salaries and expenses”, \$14,000, to be derived by
8 transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour
9 Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201
10 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$60,000 reserved
11 under “Bureau of International Labor Affairs, salaries and
12 expenses”, pursuant to said section 201) ;

13 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$21,000, to be derived by
15 transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour
16 Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201 of
17 Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$200,000 reserved
18 under “Office of the Solicitor, salaries and expenses”, pur-
19 suant to said section 201) ;

20 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

21 “Salaries and expenses”, \$121,000, to be derived by
22 transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour
23 Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201 of
24 Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$110,000 reserved
25 under “Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses”, pur-
26 suant to said section 201) ;

1 “Federal contract compliance and civil rights program,”
2 \$39,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved
3 under “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”,
4 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release
5 of \$3,000 reserved under “Federal Contract Compliance
6 and Civil Rights Program”, pursuant to said section 201) ;

7 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

8 (O U T O F P O S T A L F U N D)

9 “Administration and regional operations”; (Release
10 of \$2,107,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant
11 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 “Research, development, and engineering”, \$500,000;
13 “Operations”, \$195,071,000, and, in addition, \$62,-
14 000,000 to be derived by transfer from “Transportation”,
15 fiscal year 1969;

16 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

17 ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

18 “Salaries and expenses”, \$6,787,000, and, in addition,
19 \$750,000 to be derived by transfer from “Chamizal settle-
20 ment”, International Boundary and Water Commission,
21 United States and Mexico, and \$83,000 from “Rama Road,
22 Nicaragua”;

23 INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

24 “Missions to international organizations”, \$153,000;

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:

“Salaries and expenses”, \$43,000;

“Operation and maintenance”, \$29,000;

“American sections, international commissions”, \$19,000;

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

“Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities”, \$425,000;

OTHER

“Migration and refugee assistance”, \$26,000;

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

COAST GUARD

“Operating expenses”, \$9,500,000; (and release of \$82,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Acquisition, construction and improvements”; (Release of \$51,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Reserve training”, \$900,000; (and release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

2 “Operations”, \$30,400,000;

3 “Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports”,
4 \$220,000;

5 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

6 “Highway beautification”, \$64,000;

7 “Motor carrier safety”, \$68,000; (and release of
8 \$22,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
9 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

10 HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

11 “Limitation on general expenses”, (increase of \$875,000
12 in the limitation on administrative expenses; and
13 release of \$641,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant
14 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

15 FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

16 “Salaries and expenses”; (release of \$35,000 reserved
17 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
18 Law 90-364) ;19 “Bureau of railroad safety”, \$90,000; (and release of
20 \$83,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
21 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

22 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

23 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

24 “Salaries and expenses”, \$257,000; (and release of
25 \$134,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
26 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$2,637,000; (and release of \$1,550,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

BUREAU OF THE MINT

“Salaries and expenses”, \$500,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$425,000; (and release of \$564,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Revenue accounting and processing”, \$4,500,000;

“Compliance”, \$2,800,000; (and release of \$20,360,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

“Salaries and expenses”, \$167,000; (and release of \$85,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,338,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

“Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service”, \$3,671,000; (and release of \$677,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Operating expenses, National Archives and Records

1 Service", \$300,000; (and release of \$95,000 reserved under
2 this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
3 364) ;

4 "Operating expenses, Transportation and Communica-
5 tions Service"; (Release of \$5,000 reserved under this ap-
6 propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 "Operating expenses, Property Management and Dis-
8 posal Service"; (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this
9 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
10 364) ;

11 "Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", \$119,-
12 000;

13 "Administrative operations fund"; (Release of \$107,-
14 000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
15 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

17 "Medical and prosthetic research", \$1,168,000; (and
18 release of \$362,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
19 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

20 "Medical administration and miscellaneous operating ex-
21 penses", \$589,000;

22 OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

23 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$33,000;

1 ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

2 "Arms control and disarmament activities", (Release
3 of \$15,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
4 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;

7 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,364,000; (and release of
9 \$89,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
10 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$370,000;

13 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

14 "Limitation on administrative expenses", (increase of
15 \$97,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

16 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$970,000; (and release of
18 \$16,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
19 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

20 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

21 "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
22 penses", (Increase of \$115,000 in the limitation on adminis-
23 trative expenses and release of \$102,000 reserved under this

1 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
2 364) ;

3 **FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION**

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$90,000; (and release of
5 \$76,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
6 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 **FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE**

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$125,000; (and release of
9 \$8,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
10 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 **FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION**

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$778,000;

13 **FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION**

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$32,000;

15 **INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION**

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$818,000; (and release of
17 \$382,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
18 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

19 **NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION**

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$30,000; (and release of \$20,-
21 000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
22 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

23 **NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY**

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

1 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$250,000; (and release of
3 \$848,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
4 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

6 "Limitation on salaries and expenses", (Increase of
7 \$516,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

8 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$140,000;

10 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$594,000; (and release of
12 \$299,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
13 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

14 SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$200,000; (and release of
16 \$265,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
17 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

18 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$695,000; (and release of
20 \$125,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
21 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

22 "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art",
23 \$30,000; (and release of \$23,000 reserved under this appro-
24 priation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 TARIFF COMMISSION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, (release of \$53,000 reserved
3 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
4 Law 90-364) ;

5 TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$86,000; (and release of
7 \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
8 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

9 UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$3,500,000;

11 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

12 (OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

13 “Parks and recreation”, \$322,000;

14 “Health and welfare”, \$2,437,000;

15 “Highways and traffic”, \$163,000, of which \$140,000
16 shall be payable from the highway fund;

17 “Sanitary engineering”, \$227,000, of which \$99,000
18 shall be payable from the water fund, \$64,000 from the
19 sanitary sewage works fund, and \$1,000 from the metro-
20 politan area sanitary sewage works fund;

21 “Personal services, wage-board employees”, \$3,179,-
22 000, of which \$200,300 shall be payable from the highway
23 fund, \$184,000 from the water fund, \$169,000 from the
24 sanitary sewage works fund, and \$2,000 from the metropoli-
25 tan area sanitary sewage works fund.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET

OUTLAYS

SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first ses-

1 sion of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each
2 calendar quarter thereafter.

3 TITLE V

4 GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in
6 this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the
7 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

8 SEC. 502. Except where specifically increased or de-
9 creased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained
10 within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations
11 or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1969, limiting
12 the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or
13 for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which
14 may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations
15 available for or involving such services, are hereby increased
16 to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized
17 by or pursuant to law.

Passed the House of Representatives May 21, 1969.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

MAY 23, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

INDEX of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 10, 1969
For actions of June 9, 1969

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....15	Food stamps.....1	Parity prices.....18
Appropriations.....9	Foreign aid.....23	Pesticides.....13
Claims.....28	Foreign trade.....6,16	Postal reform.....5
Contracts.....3,29	Forestry.....27,30	Purchasing.....3
Cost estimates.....31	Freight rates.....24	Reclamation.....32
Disaster relief.....2	Hunger.....7	Rural development.....11
Electrification.....10,17	Inflation.....4	Soybean tax.....16
Environmental	Investigations.....21	Timber yield.....27
Quality.....13,20	Interest rates.....4	Trade agreements.....8
FFA.....19	Lamb imports.....14	Veterans' benefits.....26
Farm program.....25	Oceanography.....12	Water utilization.....22

HOUSE

1. FOOD STAMPS. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended; to House Agriculture and Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committees. pp. H4605, S6159
2. DISASTER RELIEF. Both Houses received from GAO a report on Federal disaster assistance to State and local governments, Office of Emergency Preparedness. pp. H4605, S6159

3. CONTRACTS. Rep. Podell spoke in support of proposed legislation which "calls for the automatic auditing by the General Accounting Office and report to the Congress on all Government contracts that are late in delivery or with cost overruns in excess of 10 percent of the agreed-upon contract price." p. H4578
4. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Vanik stated that the announcement of the increase in the prime interest rates by New York banks provides "clear and convincing evidence that the surtax has completely failed as a useful tool to stem the tide of inflation and spiralling interest charges." pp. H4593-4
5. POSTAL REFORM. Reps. Scott, Edwards, and others discussed the pros and cons of the proposed postal reform. pp. H4596-603
6. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Reuss expressed pleasure that Canada, "our major trading partner, taking over \$8 billion of our exports--is lowering its trade barriers, rather than raising them" and that it is also the Canadian Government's intention to liberalize tariff exemptions for residents returning from trips abroad. pp. H4603-4
7. HUNGER. Rep. Gonzalez criticized CBS' presentation of "Hunger in America," and stated "it is the business of a news media to report facts." p. H4604
8. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Both Houses received from the Tariff Commission its annual report on the operation of the trade agreements program, pursuant to the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. p. H4605, S6159

SENATE

9. APPROPRIATIONS. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11400, second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1969. p. D476
10. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Harris inserted the text of an essay, "What Indian Electric Cooperative Means to Our Community." pp. S6096-7
11. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Sen. Pearson inserted a statement delivered before the University of Tennessee National Seminar on Human Habitation regarding the "importance of rural development" and the relationship between rural development goals and transportation policies. pp. S6101-2
12. OCEANOGRAPHY. Sen. Magnuson inserted excerpts from the prolog of a report prepared by the National Academy of Sciences and National Academy of Engineering under the title, "An Oceanic Quest." pp. S6105-6
13. ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY. Sen. Nelson stated the "greatest challenge" we face is to "assure environmental quality for all Americans." pp. S6106-16
Sen. Nelson expressed concern about the threat to our environment from the use of persistent pesticides and inserted an article, "Nature's Expert Hunter May Become Extinct." p. S6117
Sen. Nelson inserted a summary of the results of a 2-year national pesticide study. pp. S6142-57

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 12, 1969
For actions of June 11, 1969
91st 1st No. 96

CONTENTS

Aging.....	22	Food stamps.....	15	Pollution.....	21
Appropriations.....	1	Foreign aid.....	23	Property.....	25
Biological program.....	6	Foreign trade.....	14, 16	Recreation.....	7, 34
Buildings and grounds....	5	Forestry.....	16	Research.....	6
Consumers.....	22	Health.....	8	Retirement.....	28, 32
Contracts.....	27	Housing.....	15	Rural America.....	18
Disaster relief.....	4	Indian affairs.....	9	Safety.....	20, 30
Domestic needs.....	15	Information.....	36	Shoe imports.....	14
Economic opportunity....	10	Interest rates.....	12, 19	Supplemental	
Education.....	13	Labeling.....	2	appropriations.....	1
Electrification.....	29	Lands.....	24	Taxation.....	11, 17
Environment.....	3, 21, 31	Meat inspection.....	16	Tobacco.....	8
Expenditures.....	15	Mink imports.....	16	User fees.....	34
Fire fighters.....	28	Non-farm income.....	17	Wilderness.....	33
Food and drugs.....	26	Personnel.....	30, 32	Wildlife.....	35

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee voted to report second supplemental appropriation bill.
House committee voted to report Calif. disaster relief bill.

SENATE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Senate Appropriations Committee ordered favorably reported (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill (p. D488). The Committee added language to set the limitation on fiscal year 1970 outlays at \$187.9 billion and exempt so-called uncontrollable outlays including farm price support payments (CCC). At the end of this Digest is a table reflecting Committee action on items for this Department. The bill includes the following provisions:

"Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-364, approved June 28, 1968), is hereby repealed.

"Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$187,900,000,000: Provided, That such amount shall be increased or decreased by the aggregate amount by which the sum of expenditures and net lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser than the sum of expenditures and net lending in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for—

"(1) items designated 'open-ended programs and fixed costs' in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document numbered 91-15, part 1, Ninety-first Congress);

"(2) the item designated 'Special Southeast Asia support' in the table appearing on page 27 of that budget; and

"(3) programs of aid to schools in federally impacted areas, under the Acts of Sept. 23 and Sept. 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C., Chs 13 and 19)."

2. LABELING. The "Daily Digest" states that a subcommittee of the Commerce Committee approved for full committee consideration S. 1689, to require labeling of hazardous toys and other such articles intended for use by children. p. D488
3. ENVIRONMENT. The "Daily Digest" states that a subcommittee of the Inter-governmental Relations Committee approved for full committee consideration S. Res. 78, to establish a Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment. p. D488

The following table reflects the Committee's action on items for this Department:

	Budget <u>Estimate a/</u>	House <u>Action a/</u>	Senate Committee <u>Action a/</u>	Senate Committee Bill Compared with Budget <u>Estimate</u>
Agricultural Research Service: Salaries and Expenses - Screwworm eradication program.....	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	--
Extension Service: Cooperative Extension Work, Payments and Expenses - Retirement and employees' compensation costs....	218,000	218,000	218,000	--
Soil Conservation Service: Flood prevention	4,000,000	--	4,000,000	--
Agricultural Stabilization and Conser- vation Service: Sugar Act program.....	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	--
Farmers Home Administration: Emergency Credit Revolving Fund....	--	25,000,000 <u>b/</u>	25,000,000 <u>b/</u>	+\$25,000,000 <u>b/</u>
Forest Service: Forest Protection and Utilization: Fighting forest fires.....	21,000,000	21,000,000	20,346,000	-654,000
Timber sales.....	460,000	460,000	460,000 <u>c/</u>	--
Pay costs.....	35,809,000	35,262,000	34,962,000	-847,000
Total, Department of Agriculture	<u>66,387,000</u>	<u>90,840,000</u>	<u>93,886,000</u>	<u>+\$23,499,000</u>

a/ To be provided by supplemental appropriation, release of P. L. 90-364 reserves, or by transfer among funds within the Department.

b/ Authorizes advance from the Farmers Home Administration Direct Loan Account.

c/ Language added to make this available until September 30, 1969.

Calendar No. 218

91ST CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE {

REPORT
No. 91-228

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969

JUNE 11, 1969.—Ordered to be printed

Filed under the authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11400]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

Amount of budget estimates to Senate.....	¹ \$4, 814, 305, 334
Bill as passed by the House.....	3, 783, 212, 766
Increases over House bill recommended by Senate committee.....	673, 596, 878
Decreases under budget estimate recommended by Senate committee (net).....	357, 495, 690
Total Senate Committee Bill as reported.....	4, 456, 809, 644

¹ Includes \$450,298,378 submitted to Senate and not considered by House.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969 contains five titles.

Title I relates solely to military operations in Southeast Asia. The committee recommends appropriations of \$1,272 million in this title for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force. The House made a reduction of \$262,900,000 in the budget estimates. The

committee recommends an increase of \$38 million over the House bill together with a transfer of an additional \$8,910,000.

Title II encompasses program items for many of the departments of Government and pay cost increases in those instances where there is also a program item. In this title, the committee recommends appropriations in the amount of \$1,816,672,088, an increase of \$450,757,776 over the House bill and a reduction of \$35,998,850 in the budget estimates.

Title III of the bill is devoted exclusively to pay cost increases. The committee recommends appropriations in the amount of \$1,368,137,556 an increase of \$184,839,102 over the House bill and a reduction of \$96,596,840 under the budget estimates.

Title IV of the bill contains language establishing a limitation on the ensuing fiscal year 1970 budget outlays.

Title V, the final title in the bill, contains "General provisions," customarily carried in appropriation bills.

Following this brief description of the bill is a tabulation, giving by title and chapter, the budget estimate figures for each type of authority, the recommendations of the House of Representatives, and the amounts recommended by the Senate committee.

Although the amount recommended by the Senate committee in new budget authority is \$673,596,878 over the House bill, it must be borne in mind that budget estimates to the Senate totaled \$4,814,305,334, whereas budget estimates considered by the House totaled \$4,364,006,956, a difference of \$450,298,378.

Among the emergency submissions directly to the Senate were:

Flood control and prevention-----	\$29, 000, 000
Subscription to the Inter-American Development Association-----	160, 000, 000
Veterans' pensions and readjustment benefits-----	172, 600, 000
Veterans' medical care-----	7, 611, 000
Atomic Energy Commission (fire damage)-----	45, 000, 000

In addition to items totaling over \$450 million considered by the Senate committee after the House committee completed its hearings, the Senate committee restored House reductions in appropriations for the Department of Defense in the various titles in the amount of \$222 million. The committee was advised it was vitally necessary to restore these amounts to the Defense Department.

The increases by the Senate committee are to a very large degree either programs not considered by the House because of timing or are for urgent Department of Defense activities.

The House considered estimates in House Documents 91-15, 50, 85, 94, 98, 99 and 101. In addition, the Senate Committee considered Senate Documents 91-18, 19, 21 and 22.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

SUMMARY

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
I	TITLE I					
	Military operations in Southeast Asia:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	\$1,496,900,000	\$1,234,000,000	\$1,272,000,000	-\$224,900,000	+\$38,000,000
II	TITLE II					
	Agriculture:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	13,118,000	9,118,000	13,118,000	-----	+4,000,000
III	TITLE II					
	Defense:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	249,682,000	226,050,000	227,950,000	-21,732,000	+1,900,000
IV	TITLE II					
	District of Columbia:					
	Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority.....	29,736,000	10,365,000	29,101,000	-635,000	+18,736,000
IV	TITLE II					
	District of Columbia funds:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	(44,607,000)	(25,353,000)	(44,089,000)	(-518,000)	(+18,756,000)
IV	TITLE II					
	Foreign operations:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	162,853,000	2,700,000	160,000,000	-2,853,000	+157,300,000
IV	TITLE II					
	By transfer.....	(38,000)	(35,000)	(2,755,000)	(+2,697,000)	(+2,700,000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

SUMMARY—Continued

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
V	TITLE II—Continued					
	Independent offices—Housing and Urban Development:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1968.....	\$7,168,000	\$7,168,000	\$7,168,000		
	1969.....	494,502,000	306,062,000	438,116,000	-\$6,386,000	+\$182,054,000
	Total.....	501,670,000	313,230,000	495,284,000	-6,386,000	+182,054,000
VI	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....	(104,500,000)	(32,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(-2,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)		
	Interior:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	65,136,000	54,227,000	64,225,000	-911,000	+9,998,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)		
	By transfer.....	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)		
VII	Liquidation cash.....	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)		
	Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	713,707,000	713,707,000	714,966,000	+1,259,000	+1,259,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)		
	(Limitation on salaries and expenses—trust funds).....	(16,500,000)		(21,200,000)	(+4,700,000)	(+21,200,000)
	By transfer.....	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)		

VIII	Legislative branch:						
	New budget (obligational) authority:						
	1988.....	126, 900	-----	126, 900	-----	-----	+126, 900
IX	1989.....	-----	30, 000	60, 000	+60, 000	-----	+30, 000
	Public works.....	70, 000, 000	-----	70, 000, 000	-----	-----	+70, 000, 000
X	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:						
	New budget (obligational) authority:						
	1988.....	860, 000	10, 000	860, 000	-----	-----	+850, 000
	1989.....	17, 606, 350	15, 013, 500	15, 799, 500	-1, 806, 850	-----	+786, 000
	Total.....	18, 466, 350	15, 023, 500	16, 659, 500	-1, 806, 850	-----	+1, 636, 000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(1, 701, 000)	(1, 701, 000)	(1, 701, 000)	-----	-----	-----
	Limitation increase.....	(147, 000)	-----	(147, 000)	-----	-----	(+147, 000)
	By transfer.....	(220, 000)	(220, 000)	(220, 000)	-----	-----	-----
XI	Transportation:						
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	7, 232, 000	2, 238, 000	4, 238, 000	-2, 934, 000	-----	+2, 000, 000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(28, 000)	(28, 000)	(28, 000)	-----	-----	-----
XII	Treasury-Post Office:						
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	2, 755, 000	2, 235, 000	2, 695, 000	-60, 000	-----	+410, 000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(394, 000)	(394, 000)	(394, 000)	-----	-----	-----

RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL--Continued

SUMMARY--Continued

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with--	
					Budget estimate	House bill
XIII	TITLE II--Continued					
	Claims and judgments.....	\$18, 188, 688	\$16, 880, 812	\$18, 188, 688		+\$1, 307, 876
	Total, title II:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1968.....	8, 154, 900	7, 178, 000	8, 154, 900		+976, 900
	1969.....	1, 844, 516, 038	1, 358, 736, 312	1, 808, 517, 188	-\$35, 998, 850	+449, 780, 876
	Total.....	1, 852, 670, 938	1, 365, 914, 312	1, 816, 672, 088	-35, 998, 850	+450, 757, 776
	<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations</i>	<i>(104, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(32, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(102, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(-2, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(+20, 000, 000)</i>
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	<i>(20, 489, 000)</i>	<i>(20, 489, 000)</i>	<i>(20, 489, 000)</i>		
	<i>Limitation increases.....</i>	<i>(16, 647, 000)</i>		<i>(21, 347, 000)</i>	<i>(+4, 700, 000)</i>	<i>(+21, 347, 000)</i>
	<i>By transfer.....</i>	<i>(11, 232, 000)</i>	<i>(11, 229, 000)</i>	<i>(23, 306, 000)</i>	<i>(+12, 074, 000)</i>	<i>(+12, 077, 000)</i>
	<i>Liquidation cash.....</i>	<i>(19, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(19, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(19, 000, 000)</i>		
	Increased pay costs (included above):					
	<i>Budget authority.....</i>	<i>(135, 378, 400)</i>	<i>(116, 455, 000)</i>	<i>(124, 846, 400)</i>	<i>(-10, 532, 000)</i>	<i>(+8, 411, 000)</i>
	<i>Release of reserves.....</i>	<i>(18, 689, 000)</i>	<i>(18, 689, 000)</i>	<i>(18, 689, 000)</i>		
	<i>By transfer.....</i>	<i>(1, 386, 000)</i>	<i>(1, 383, 000)</i>	<i>(3, 983, 000)</i>	<i>(+2, 597, 000)</i>	<i>(+2, 600, 000)</i>
	Total.....	<i>(155, 353, 400)</i>	<i>(136, 407, 400)</i>	<i>(147, 418, 400)</i>	<i>(-7, 935, 000)</i>	<i>(+11, 011, 000)</i>
	TITLE III					
	INCREASED PAY COSTS					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	1, 464, 734, 396	1, 183, 298, 454	1, 368, 137, 556	-96, 596, 840	+184, 839, 102
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(59, 510, 000)	(62, 277, 000)	(59, 741, 000)	(+251, 000)	(-2, 536, 000)

<i>By transfer</i> -----	(85, 873, 000)	(81, 676, 000)	(87, 916, 000)	(+2, 045, 000)	(+6, 240, 000)
<i>Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(24, 223, 000)	(22, 223, 000)	(22, 223, 000)	(-2, 000, 000)	-----
TITLE V					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
<i>Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill (H. Doc. 91-56)</i> -----	(630, 000)	(630, 000)	(630, 000)	-----	-----
RECAPITULATION					
Grand total, titles I, II, III, and V:					
New budget (obligational) authority:					
1968-----	8, 154, 900	7, 178, 000	8, 154, 900	-----	+976, 900
1969-----	4, 806, 150, 434	3, 776, 034, 766	4, 448, 654, 774	-357, 495, 690	+672, 619, 978
Total-----	4, 814, 305, 334	3, 783, 212, 766	4, 456, 809, 644	-357, 495, 690	+673, 596, 878
<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations</i> -----	(104, 500, 000)	(82, 500, 000)	(102, 500, 000)	(-2, 000, 000)	(+20, 000, 000)
<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i> -----	(79, 999, 000)	(82, 766, 000)	(80, 230, 000)	(+231, 000)	(-2, 656, 000)
<i>By transfer</i> -----	(97, 105, 000)	(92, 905, 000)	(120, 132, 000)	(+23, 027, 000)	(+27, 227, 000)
<i>Liquidation cash</i> -----	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	-----	-----
<i>Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(40, 870, 000)	(22, 223, 000)	(43, 570, 000)	(+2, 700, 000)	(+21, 347, 000)
<i>Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds or personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill</i> -----	(630, 000)	(630, 000)	(630, 000)	-----	-----
<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(1, 600, 112, 796)	(1, 299, 753, 854)	(1, 492, 983, 956)	(-107, 128, 840)	(+193, 250, 102)
<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(78, 099, 000)	(80, 866, 000)	(78, 350, 000)	(+231, 000)	(-2, 636, 000)
<i>By transfer</i> -----	(87, 259, 000)	(83, 059, 000)	(91, 399, 000)	(+4, 640, 000)	(+8, 840, 000)
<i>Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(24, 223, 000)	(22, 223, 000)	(22, 223, 000)	(-2, 000, 000)	-----
<i>Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill</i> -----	(630, 000)	(630, 000)	(630, 000)	-----	-----
Total-----	(1, 790, 323, 796)	(1, 486, 511, 854)	(1, 686, 066, 956)	(-104, 257, 840)	(+199, 554, 102)

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Budget estimates (as revised in H. Doc. 91-94).....	¹ \$1, 496, 900, 000
House allowance.....	1, 234, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	² 1, 272, 000, 000

¹ The original supplemental estimates submitted in H. Doc. No. 91-50 totaled \$1,531,500,000.

² And in addition \$8,910,000 to be derived by transfer.

The committee considered revised supplemental estimates totaling \$1,496.9 million for the support of military operations in Southeast Asia, and recommends appropriations totaling \$1,272 million and the transfer of \$8,910,000 to provide for a total of \$1,280,910,000 for this purpose. The total recommended appropriation and transfer represents an increase of \$46,910,000 over the House allowance, and a reduction of \$215,990,000 in the revised supplemental estimates.

The amounts of the revised supplemental estimates, the House allowances, and the committee recommendations for each appropriation involved are set out in the following tabulation:

ACTION ON SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES IN TITLE I

	Revised budget estimate	House allowance	Senate committee recommen- dation
Military personnel:			
Military personnel, Army.....	\$136, 200, 000	\$110, 000, 000	\$110, 000, 000
Military personnel, Navy.....	21, 500, 000	14, 500, 000	21, 500, 000
Military personnel, Air Force.....	146, 000, 000	115, 000, 000	146, 000, 000
Subtotal.....	303, 700, 000	239, 500, 000	277, 500, 000
Operation and Maintenance:			
Operation and maintenance, Army.....	144, 600, 000	96, 310, 000	96, 310, 000
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps.....	24, 300, 000	15, 390, 000	¹ 15, 390, 000
Operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	307, 300, 000	242, 700, 000	242, 700, 000
Subtotal.....	476, 200, 000	354, 400, 000	¹ 354, 400, 000
Procurement: Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army.....	717, 000, 000	640, 100, 000	640, 100, 000
Total.....	1, 496, 900, 000	1, 234, 000, 000	1, 272, 000, 000

¹ And in addition \$8,910,000 to be derived by transfer.

REQUIREMENT FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

The supplemental requests are required to fund increases in the strength of the Armed Forces, additional deployments of United Forces to Southeast Asia, and higher operating tempos and consumption following the Tet offensive and the seizure of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* in January of 1968. Funds for these actions were not included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1969 (Public Law 90-580). Additional funds are also required to accelerate the program to modernize the armed forces of South Vietnam.

The recommendations of the committee with respect to funds for the support of military operations in Southeast Asia do not in any way constitute a basis for an escalation or deescalation of combat operations in South Vietnam.

MODERNIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES OF SOUTH VIETNAM

The recommendations of the committee include \$308.1 million for the accelerated program to modernize the armed forces of South Vietnam. These funds and \$132 million included for this purpose in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1969, and \$85.9 million being made available through the reprogramming of available funds will provide for a total of \$526 million for this program for the current fiscal year. The budget for fiscal year 1970 includes \$651.9 million for this purpose.

Of the total of \$526 million to be made available for this program during the current fiscal year, approximately \$490.2 million is for phase I of the program which is designed to provide the maximum feasible ground combat capability for the South Vietnamese ground forces. This phase is based on the assumption that the United States and North Vietnam will withdraw their forces from South Vietnam at some indeterminate date.

MILITARY PERSONNEL

The total recommended by the committee for the support of military operations in Southeast Asia includes \$277.5 million for the various military personnel appropriations, which represents a decrease of \$26.2 million in the requests and an increase of \$38 million over the House allowances. It is the view of the committee that the sum recommended will be required to support the increase in the average strength of the Armed Forces from 3,427,907, funded in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1969, to the current level of 3,471,095—an increase of 43,188; and the cost of the additional 53,000 personnel deployed to South Vietnam and other areas of Southeast Asia paid from these appropriations. The recommended reduction of \$26.2 million in the request results from a reduction based on a recent review of these requirements and funds available for these requirements.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The total recommended by the committee for the support of military operations in Southeast Asia includes \$354,400,000 in new appropriations and \$8,910,000 to be derived by transfer for a total of \$363,310,000 for the operation and maintenance appropriations of the Army, Marine Corps, and the Air Force. The total recommended (appropriation and transfer) for these appropriations represents a reduction of \$112,890,000 in the requests totaling \$476.2 million and an increase of \$8,910,000 in the House allowances. These additional funds are required for the support of the additional personnel and deployments referred to in the discussion of the military personnel appropriations. Based on a recent review of these additional requirements, it is the view of the committee that the sum recommended and the funds that can be made available from savings in other programs are adequate.

PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES, ARMY

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of \$640.1 million for this appropriation, which is a reduction of \$76.9

million in the supplemental request of \$717 million. The sum recommended is for the following:

Tracked combat vehicles.....	\$10, 100, 000
Tactical and support vehicles.....	92, 700, 000
Communications and electronics.....	41, 400, 000
Support equipment.....	56, 100, 000
Ammunition.....	419, 500, 000
Production base support.....	20, 300, 000
Total.....	640, 100, 000

The committee's recommendation is based on concurrence in the following specific House reductions:

Aircraft and aircraft spares, \$62,200,000.—It is the view of the committee that the essential requirements included in this request can be provided within the funds available for these purposes.

Quick erectable antennas, \$3,300,000.—It is the view of the committee that funds can be made available for the required procurement of this item from available resources upon the completion of the engineering test program.

Production base support, \$11,400,000.—The facilities included in this reduction of \$11,400,000 will again be reviewed by the committee during its consideration of the Department of Defense appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970.

TITLE II

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURE RESEARCH SERVICE

PLANT AND ANIMAL DISEASE AND PEST CONTROL

1969 appropriation.....	\$86, 639, 500
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94).....	1, 400, 000
House bill.....	1, 400, 000
Senate committee recommendation.....	1, 400, 000

The committee recommends a supplemental appropriation of \$1,400,000 to combat the serious screw-worm outbreak which has developed in the Southwestern United States. This is the same amount contained in the House bill and the supplemental estimate.

Since the heavy rains occasioned by Hurricane Beulah late in the fall of 1967, weather conditions in the Southwestern United States and northern Mexico have been very favorable for the propagation and buildup of the screw-worm population. By late 1968, the increase in screw-worm population reached such large proportions that it became necessary to step up the production of flies during the period of the year in which there is normally a reduction of fly production and release. The additional expense thus incurred resulted in the necessity of apportioning the funds for this activity on a deficiency basis. The Bureau of the Budget notified the Congress of this action on March 20, 1969.

The funds recommended in this supplemental will allow the Department to continue producing sterile flies at the rate of 150 million per week. This is the minimum amount necessary to meet the present threat and to guard against further infestation from Mexico.

The committee expects that Federal funds will be matched by State and local funds for the eradication of outbreaks occurring north of the barrier zone.

EXTENSION SERVICE

RETIREMENT COSTS FOR EXTENSION AGENTS

1969 appropriation-----	\$97, 063, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	218, 000
House bill-----	218, 000
Senate committee recommendation-----	218, 000

The Senate committee recommends an appropriation of \$218,000 to meet the mandatory retirement costs for Extension agents. This is the same amount contained in the House bill and the full amount of the supplemental estimate contained in House Document 91-94. The fiscal year 1969 appropriation bill for the Department provided \$3 million for salary increases for Cooperative Extension agents. These supplemental funds are necessary to meet the increased Federal contributions to the retirement fund resulting from that action.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

FLOOD PREVENTION

1969 appropriation-----	\$20, 000, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	¹ 4, 000, 000
House bill (not considered by House)-----	-----
Senate committee recommendation-----	4, 000, 000

¹ S. Doc. 91-18 proposed \$4,224,000, of which \$224,000 was for increased pay costs. However, House bill contains \$224,000 for this purpose in title II.

The committee recommends the supplemental estimate of \$4 million transmitted to the Senate in Senate Document 91-18, to meet the costs of installing emergency conservation measures for runoff retardation and soil erosion prevention in California and Nevada, under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950.

Serious floods which occurred in California in January 1969 resulted in damages exceeding \$425 million and caused a loss directly or indirectly of 111 lives, and 34 of the 58 counties in California have been declared disaster areas.

These funds are urgently needed for the installation of emergency measures such as channel clearing and debris removal, repairing of dams and streambank stabilization, reseeding, and other practices to prevent further serious erosion and landslides. In Nevada, there is a need to protect a critically burned area in Ash Canyon, Carson City, Nev., by reseeding and terracing.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SUGAR ACT

1969 appropriation-----	\$82, 000, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	7, 500, 000
House bill-----	7, 500, 000
Senate committee recommendation-----	7, 500, 000

The committee recommends supplemental appropriations of \$7,500,000 to meet payments due producers under the Sugar Act program. These additional payments are necessary because the 1968 crop production, upon which these mandatory payments are based, was greater than earlier estimates pending when the regular 1969 appropriation bill was enacted.

Sugar payments are mandatory to domestic producers who comply with the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and payments are financed from a tax of 53.5 cents per 100 pounds on all beet and cane sugar processed or imported into the United States. To date, these tax collections, which go into the general fund of the Treasury, have exceeded producer payments under this act by \$594.9 million.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

The committee concurs in the action of the House to include language in this bill which will authorize the temporary transfer of \$25 million of unobligated funds from the Farmers Home Administration direct loan account of the emergency credit revolving fund.

Recent floods, snows and other natural disasters which have occurred throughout the country have created an immediate demand for over \$10 million of emergency farm credit in excess of the present limit of the revolving fund and, in addition, officials of the Department inform the committee that emergency credit demands during the early part of the next fiscal year are expected to exceed collections to the emergency fund by \$15 million.

Senate Joint Resolution 111, reported April 22, 1969, proposes to meet the same objective as the recommended language by authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to advance up to \$25 million to the emergency credit revolving fund. The Department filed a report on Senate Joint Resolution 111, and stated that in view of the language contained in the pending supplemental appropriation bill, they would not need separate legislative authority to borrow money from the Commodity Credit Corporation. Language in the bill requires the direct loan account to be repaid from future repayments to the emergency credit revolving fund.

INCREASED PAY COSTS

Under title III of the bill, the committee recommends a total of \$28,030,000 for increased pay costs of the Department during fiscal year 1969. Of this amount, \$12,605,000 is provided by supplemental appropriations contained in this bill, \$10,243,000 is provided by the release of reserves pursuant to Public Law 90-364, and \$5,182,000 is provided by transfers among funds within the Department.

The total amount provided by appropriated funds is \$1,347,000 below the supplemental estimates and \$300,000 below the amount recommended in the House bill.

The amount provided by release of Public Law 90-364 reserves is \$500,000 over the amount recommended in the estimates, and the same amount provided in the House bill.

The Senate bill represents a net decrease of \$847,000 under the budget estimate and \$300,000 under the House bill.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

1969 appropriation-----	\$125, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	8, 500, 000
House allowance-----	4, 150, 000
Committee recommendation-----	4, 150, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$4,150,000, a reduction of \$4,350,000 from the budget estimate. Of the amount recommended, \$1 million is for per diem of reservists and Reserve officer candidates as authorized by Public Law 90-168 and \$3,150,000 is for unabsorbed additional costs of the military pay raise, effective July 1, 1968.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

1969 appropriation-----	\$31, 100, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	9, 900, 000
Revised estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	6, 800, 000
House allowance-----	4, 500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	6, 400, 000

The committee recommends \$6,400,000 for this appropriation, an increase of \$1,900,000 over the House allowance and a reduction of \$400,000 from the revised supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94). The increase over the House is deemed necessary to maintain the present approved Reserve manpower program. Of the increase, \$800,000 is for the funding of the military pay raise authorized by Public Law 90-207, \$300,000 is for per diem costs authorized by Public Law 90-168, and \$800,000 is for funding an increase in the average strength as authorized by Public Law 90-500. Of the total amount recommended, \$300,000 is for the per diem payments, \$1,600,000 is for the pay increase, and \$4,500,000 is for the maintenance of the average strength.

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

1969 appropriation-----	\$2, 275, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate, H. Doc. 91-50-----	175, 000, 000
House allowance-----	175, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	175, 000, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$175 million, the budget estimate. Of this amount, \$162 million is required to implement the cost-of-living increases in retired pay, the first effective April 1, 1968, and the second effective February 1, 1969, and an increase of approximately 13,816 in the average number of retired personnel expected to be on the rolls during fiscal year 1969. The additional \$13 million is attributable to the military pay increases effective July 1, 1968, for those military personnel who have retired after that date.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

1969 appropriation-----	\$5, 356, 200, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	26, 100, 000
House allowance-----	20, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	20, 000, 000

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of \$20 million for this appropriation, a reduction of \$6,100,000 from the revised budget estimate. The entire amount is for the civilian

pay raise as authorized by Public Law 90-206 and represents that portion of the pay increase that cannot be absorbed.

The committee recommends concurrence in House action in denying the request of the Department of the Navy which would have reduced the floor placed on the maintenance of real property facilities from \$155,600,000 to \$138,600,000. Continued deferred maintenance incurring increased backlogs of repair are, in the opinion of the committee, false economy. It is the view of the committee that the funds appropriated specifically for this purpose should be obligated for this purpose.

Procurement of T-39 aircraft

In February of this year the committee disapproved the request of the Department of Defense to use available funds in the appropriation "Operation and maintenance, Navy" for the lease of four T-39 type aircraft for the Navy's "rapid response airlift" mission. It is the view of the committee that a lease with an option to purchase is not the proper procurement procedure for the purchase of aircraft which are required by the services.

The committee suggests that this matter be resubmitted for the outright purchase of these aircraft through the reprogramming of available funds in the appropriation "Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy."

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

1969 appropriation.....	\$435, 700, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50).....	4, 600, 000
House allowance.....	3, 600, 000
Committee recommendation.....	¹ 3, 600, 000

¹ And in addition \$1,000,000 to be derived by transfer.

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of \$3,600,000 for this appropriation but provides an additional \$1 million to be derived by transfer to provide for a total of \$4,600,000. The total recommended is required to provide for the pay increases for civilian employees effective July 1, 1968.

The committee concurs in the House action in denying the request of the Marine Corps to reduce the floor placed on the maintenance of real property facilities from \$22,661,000 to \$21,161,000. It does so for the same reasons as indicated above in connection with a similar request of the Department of the Navy.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

1969 appropriation.....	\$264, 664, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50).....	13, 000, 000
House allowance.....	10, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	¹ 10, 000, 000

¹ And in addition \$3,000,000 to be derived by transfer.

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of \$10 million for this appropriation but provides an additional \$3 million to be derived by transfer for a total of \$13 million, which is an increase of \$3 million over the sum included in the House bill. Of the increase recommended \$1,400,000 is required as a result of the federalization of

National Guard technicians pursuant to Public Law 90-486 and \$1,600,000 is for authorized pay increases to civilian personnel. Of the total recommended \$5,400,000 is the federalization of National Guard technicians and \$7,600,000 is for civilian pay increases.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

1969 appropriation-----	\$267, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	15, 682, 000
House allowance-----	8, 800, 000
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 8, 800, 000

¹ And in addition \$5,377,000 to be derived by transfer.

The committee recommends concurrence in the House allowance of \$8,800,000 for this appropriation but provides an additional \$5,377,000 to be derived by transfer for a total of \$14,177,000—an increase of \$5,377,000 over the House allowance. Of the increase provided, \$2 million is necessary to repair the aircraft apron and taxiway at Gulfport, Miss., used in connection with Southeast Asia support, which have deteriorated to a hazardous condition; \$1,228,000 is needed for maintenance and repair of Air National Guard F-102 air defense fighter aircraft; \$1,399,000 is required for resupply of units returning to National Guard status after the active duty callup in connection with the Tet offensive and the *Pueblo* incident; and \$750,000 is needed to fund facility repair projects.

GENERAL PROVISIONS (SECTION 201)

The committee recommends deletion of section 201 of the House bill which provides:

SEC. 201. Deficiencies incurred under the terms of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 11), shall not exceed the amounts of the estimates in House Documents Numbered 91-50 and 91-94, or the amounts provided herein, whichever is lower, for each such authorized purpose.

It was the view of the committee that it is too late in the fiscal year to impose any meaningful restriction on fiscal year 1969 obligations incurred pursuant to the authority in section 3732 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 11). Furthermore, the Department of Defense advised the committee that procedures had been established to assure that all obligations incurred pursuant to the authority in section 3732 of the Revised Statute could be liquidated from available funds and the funds recommended in this bill, and that there will be no requests in the future for funds for the liquidation of such obligations.

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL PAYMENT

1969 appropriation-----	\$79, 000, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	11, 000, 000
House allowance-----	10, 365, 000
Restoration requested-----	+98, 000
Committee recommendation-----	10, 365, 000

The committee recommends an increase of \$10,365,000 in the Federal payment. This additional amount, which is the House allowance, will provide a total federal payment of \$89,365,000 of the \$90 million authorized for fiscal year 1969 to help defray expenses of the District of Columbia government that are payable from the general fund account.

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

1969 appropriation-----	\$65, 125, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	18, 736, 000
House allowance-----	0
Committee recommendation-----	18, 736, 000

The committee recommends the request for a federal loan to the District of Columbia for capital outlay in the amount of \$18,736,000. This sum will provide initial construction funds for the rapid rail transit system.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

1969 appropriation-----	\$32, 819, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	1, 070, 000
House allowance-----	975, 000
Committee recommendation-----	975, 000

The committee recommends \$975,000 for general operating expenses. This sum includes funds for unabsorbable pay increases provided by Public Law 90-206 (\$845,000), and the school transit subsidy (\$130,000) as provided by Public Law 84-320 and Public Law 87-507.

PUBLIC SAFETY

1969 appropriation-----	\$104, 599, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-99)-----	10, 457, 000
House allowance-----	10, 034, 000
Restoration requested-----	+98, 000
Committee recommendation-----	10, 034, 000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending a total of \$10,034,000 for public safety.

Included in the total sum is \$8,098,000 in unabsorbable pay costs and \$15,000 in retirement pay. The former amount includes increases provided for civilians by Public Law 90-206 (\$1,266,000) and for firemen and policemen under Public Law 90-320 (\$6,748,000); and for the courts under Public Law 90-579 (\$84,000).

Also included is \$1,302,000 for fire and police overtime (\$1,175,000) and increased court costs (\$127,000). These costs relate to civil disturbances in April and May 1968 and were authorized by the Commissioner under authority of 31 U.S.C. 665 (e)(1)(B).

Also recommended is \$190,000 for police overtime (November 29 through December 24, 1968) as authorized by the Commissioner.

Also recommended is \$429,000 to improve the city's correctional system. This sum includes funds for overtime and unabsorbable losses occasioned in connection with disturbances at correctional institutions (\$300,000); initiation of four of a projected total of 10 community based centers for the work release program (\$47,500); continuation of inservice training for correctional officers \$34,000); a total of 47 new correctional personnel at the District of Columbia jail and the women's detention center (\$32,500); and improved health services (\$15,000). Language has been added to the bill to extend the avail-

ability until September 30, 1969, of funds for the Department of Corrections to establish new community based rehabilitation centers, hire new correctional personnel, and provide for improved health services. In carrying out the work release program, the committee strongly recommends that caution be used to carefully screen all individuals approved for housing in the four community based centers.

The committee concurs in the reductions made by the House for the support of judges authorized but not yet appointed to the court of general sessions, and after ascertaining the adequacy of facilities presently available, it does not favorably recommend at this time allowance of the appeal of \$98,000 which represents a portion of these funds.

EDUCATION

1969 appropriation.....	\$108, 676, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50).....	13, 931, 000
House allowance.....	13, 931, 000
Committee recommendation.....	13, 931, 000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending the full amount of \$13,931,000 for Education.

The total sum includes increases provided for civilian pay increases under Public Law 90-206 (\$285,000); for teachers under Public Law 90-319 (\$12,800,000); and for changes in the public school food services program brought about by Public Law 90-640 (\$846,000).

HEALTH AND WELFARE

1969 appropriation.....	\$121, 356, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-99).....	111, 000
House allowance.....	111, 000
Committee recommendation.....	111, 000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending the full amount of \$111,000 for health and welfare. This sum provides for reallocating new nursing positions pursuant to new standards issued by the Civil Service Commission.

SANITARY ENGINEERING

1969 appropriation.....	\$30, 735, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-99).....	252, 000
House allowance.....	252, 000
Committee recommendation.....	252, 000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending the full amount of \$252,000 for sanitary engineering. This sum provides for increased pay costs brought about by reclassification of positions.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

1969 appropriation.....	\$28, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-99).....	50, 000
House allowance.....	50, 000
Committee recommendation.....	50, 000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending the full amount of \$50,000 for settlement of claims and suits not in excess of \$250 and approved by the Commissioner in accordance with existing legislation.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

1969 Appropriation.....	\$109, 100, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50).....	\$18, 736, 000
House allowance.....	(¹)
Committee recommendation.....	18, 736, 000

¹ Not considered.

The committee recommends \$18,736,000 in capital outlay. This sum, when added to matching funds presently available, will provide for continuation of engineering and design work and permit initiation of construction of the rapid rail transit system.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN OPERATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

1969 appropriations to date.....	\$69, 774, 000
Supplemental estimate.....	2, 853, 000
House allowance.....	2, 700, 000
Committee recommendation.....	(2, 700, 000)

The committee concurs with the allowance of the House, but disagrees with the method of funding employed by the House for this item. Since there are unobligated funds which were heretofore made available by the Congress to finance programs of the Agency for International Development, the committee felt that a portion of these unobligated balances should be used to fund the supplemental requirements of the Cuban refugee program. Consequently, the committee has stricken the \$2,700,000 of new obligational authority granted by the House and, in lieu thereof, has included language which provides that the \$2,700,000 is *to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic Assistance," fiscal year 1969, of the Agency for International Development.*

The sum recommended by the committee is \$153,000 below the budget estimate contained in House Document 50, and the amount was not appealed by the Department. In fact, subsequent to the House markup of the bill, the Department informed the committee that the aforesaid reduction would be absorbed out of the student loan program.

The amount provided by the committee will furnish financing for the unanticipated welfare costs of the refugees resettled outside of Miami, Fla.; for the increased per-pupil rates for Cuban children in the Dade County, Fla., school system; and for the costs of transporting refugees from Cuba to Miami.

The committee was concerned that heretofore no effort has been made to obtain reimbursement from refugees for the costs of their transportation and the \$42 transitional allowance which is given to certain refugees. In this connection, the subcommittee chairman inter-

rogated Deputy Administrator, Mr. Joseph V. Meyers. An excerpt, from page 306 of the hearings on the bill, concerning this matter follows:

Senator BYRD. Why shouldn't those who are later employed be required to pay back the original allowance of \$42 and also their transportation costs? It seems to me that a person who is eager to get out of Cuba would be glad to pay transportation costs once he gets employment.

Mr. MEYERS. It certainly is a possibility, Senator. We had not thought it was indicated in the program heretofore, because it is not given to anyone who is not in need at the time. We probably could set up some sort of a program which would require a person to repay, just as a loan, but we have not considered these as loans; they have been outright grants.

Senator BYRD. Well, what would be the obstacle to considering such a program?

Mr. MEYERS. I think it is something we can take a look at. Most of the people, particularly those in this later airlift era, don't have high earnings. So I am not sure how much potential there would be in establishing a loan program; that is one of the things. It would also be quite a problem in terms of the administrative problems involved; but I don't discount the possibility, and certainly it is something we can take a look at.

The committee feels that a real effort should be made to explore the possibilities of establishing the necessary administrative procedures to effect reimbursement of the transportation and transitional allowances of Cuban refugees. The committee is not unaware of the problems involved, including those in the field of foreign policy, nevertheless, it feels that some method should be devised to permit our Government to recover these costs.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SUBSCRIPTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

1969 appropriations to date.....	None
Supplemental estimate.....	\$160, 000, 000
House allowance.....	(1)
Committee recommendations.....	160, 000, 000

¹ Not considered by the House.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$160 million, the budget estimate, for payment of the first installment of the second replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association (IDA).

Since this item was not considered by the House, it was necessary for the committee to include the following amendment in the bill:

On page 7, after line 14, insert the following:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SUBSCRIPTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment of the first installment of the United States share of the 1969-71 increase in the resources of the International Development Association, as authorized by law, \$160,000,000, to remain available until expended.

H.R. 33, which authorized U.S. participation, to the extent of \$480 million, in the second replenishment of the resources of IDA aggregating \$1.2 billion, passed the House of Representatives on March 12 of this year. The bill passed the Senate without amendment on May 14, and an official estimate, contained in Senate Document No. 91-19, covering the first of three equal installments in the amount of \$160 million, was received by the committee on May 21.

Through fiscal year 1968, a total of \$632,290,000 had been appropriated by the Congress for the use of IDA. Of this sum, \$320,290,000 covered our Nation's initial subscription to IDA, which was authorized by Public Law 86-565, approved June 30, 1960. The amount due under the initial subscription was payable in five installments, the last of which being paid in November 1964.

In 1964, 18 member countries of IDA agreed to add \$750 million to its resources through supplementary contributions payable in equal annual installments during fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968. The U.S. share of this so-called first replenishment of IDA was \$312 million, payable in installments of \$104 million each over the 3 aforementioned years.

CHAPTER V

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

1969 appropriation-----	\$1, 675, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	777, 000
House allowance-----	500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	777, 000

The committee recommends restoration of \$277,000, to provide the full amount of the supplemental request of \$777,000 to support frequency-sharing experimentation between communication satellite and terrestrial microwave systems, which is urgently required in order to safeguard U.S. interests in forthcoming international negotiations.

The committee is advised that while the experimentations will add data to the multiagency, multipurpose project which involves NASA, FCC, DOD, Commerce, and the Office of Science and Technology, the particular measurements sought would not be available through any other source in or out of the Government.

The committee is further advised that the estimate of \$777,000 is the minimum amount required for the experimentations, that there is no duplication of effort involved with any other Government agency, and no other funding is available for this purpose.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF	
1969 appropriation.....	\$10, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94).....	35, 000, 000
House allowance.....	35, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	35, 000, 000

The committee concurs with the House recommendation of the full amount of the supplemental estimate of \$35 million required to provide relief for areas devastated by natural disasters which occurred early in 1969.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES	
1969 appropriation.....	\$16, 300, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Docs. 91-50, 91-94).....	650, 000
Release of reserves.....	(81, 000)
House allowance.....	600, 000
Release of reserves.....	(81, 000)
Committee recommendation.....	600, 000
Release of reserves.....	(81, 000)

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$600,000 and the release of \$81,000 held in reserve under Public Law 90-364 for salaries and expenses of the Commission. The amount is \$50,000 less than the supplemental request.

The committee recommends that funds be available until September 30, 1969.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES	
1969 appropriation.....	\$400, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50).....	Language
House allowance.....	Denied
Committee recommendation.....	Language

The committee recommends restoration of the language denied by the House wherein the Foundation may purchase a replacement aircraft.

The committee is advised that the loss of the aircraft which crashed into Lake Superior last October (Beechcraft Queen Air A-80) has seriously disrupted ongoing research projects and, unless a replacement aircraft is obtained soon, important atmospheric research projects planned for this summer will have to be canceled.

The committee is further advised that the two Government-owned aircraft currently in use by the Foundation are a DeHavilland Buffalo and a North American Sabreliner jet, which are not suitable for the research involved; and the leased Queen Air does not meet the requirements of the research projects. The cost of replacement with a Queen Air B-80 plus avionics, instrumentation, and modification is estimated at \$296,000, for which funds are available.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation-----	\$63, 568, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	3, 139, 000
House allowance-----	2, 573, 000
Committee recommendation-----	3, 139, 000

The committee recommends restoration of \$566,000, to provide the full amount of the supplemental estimate of \$3,139,000 to meet the requirements of adjusting the workload from 240,000 inductions to 260,000 due to revised Department of Defense estimates and to cover the increased statutory pay costs for civilian and military personnel.

The committee has been further advised that no new full-time positions will be filled. The \$566,000 restoration includes 93 man-years with an accompanying \$41,000 for personnel benefits. The highly decentralized local board operations do not require full-time permanent positions but results in longer hours for part-time boards, temporary intermittent employees, and occasional overtime for full-time employees.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

1969 appropriation-----	\$4, 654, 336, 000
Supplemental estimates:	
H. Doc. 91-50-----	179, 000, 000
S. Doc. 91-18-----	97, 600, 000
House allowance (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	179, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	276, 600, 000

The committee recommends \$276,600,000, to include the House allowance of \$179 million, and an additional amount of \$97,600,000 which was not considered by the House. The committee recommendation is the full amount of the revised supplemental request.

The amendment in the amount of \$97,600,000 is required for the payment of veterans' benefits as a result of newly enacted legislation, as well as unanticipated caseload increases.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

1969 appropriation-----	\$612, 000, 000
Supplemental estimates:	
H. Doc. 91-50-----	14, 200, 000
S. Doc. 91-18-----	75, 000, 000
House allowance (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	14, 200, 000
Committee recommendation-----	89, 200, 000

The committee recommends \$89,200,000, to include the House allowance of \$14,200,000, and an additional amount of \$75 million which was not considered by the House. The committee recommendation is the full amount of the revised supplemental request.

The amendment in the amount of \$75 million is required for the payment of educational benefits that arise by operation of law and are not administratively controllable. The average training load is higher than anticipated and the average unit cost is higher than planned.

MEDICAL CARE

1969 appropriation	\$1, 420, 264, 000
Supplemental estimates:	
(H. Doc. 91-50)	46, 189, 000
and release of reserves	(15, 167, 000)
(S. Doc. 91-18)	7, 611, 000
House allowance (H. Doc. 91-50)	46, 189, 000
Release of reserves	(15, 167, 800)
Committee recommendation	53, 800, 000
Release of reserves	(15, 167, 800)

The committee recommends \$53,800,000 and the release of \$15,167,-800 held in reserve under the provisions of Public Law 90-364. This includes the House allowance of \$46,189,000 and the release of \$15,167,800 held in reserve plus an additional amount of \$7,611,000 which was not considered by the House. The committee recommendation is the full amount of the revised supplemental request.

The original request was to meet increased costs due to unanticipated workload increases and the amendment, an increase of \$7,611,000 covers the added cost of wage board pay increases.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

1969 appropriation	\$195, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)	12, 500, 000
House allowance	12, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	12, 000, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$12 million for general operating expenses of the administration, a reduction of \$500,000 below the supplemental request.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

COLLEGE HOUSING

1969 appropriation (contract authority)	(\$3, 000, 000)
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)	(4, 500, 000)
House allowance	(2, 500, 000)
Committee recommendation	(2, 500, 000)

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$2,500,000 in contract authority for debt service grants for privately financed private loans for college housing. This is a reduction of \$2 million below the supplemental request.

LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

1969 appropriation	\$350, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50):	
For 1968	7, 168, 000
For 1969	16, 000, 000
House allowance:	
For 1968	7, 168, 000
For 1969	16, 000, 000
Committee recommendation:	
For 1968	7, 168, 000
For 1969	16, 000, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$7,168,000 in low-rent public housing contributions for 1968 and \$16 million for contributions in 1969. The recommendation is the full amount of the supplemental request to meet Federal commitments under contracts with local housing authorities.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

1969 appropriation (payments)-----	\$7, 000, 000
Contract authority:	
For sec. 235-----	(25, 000, 000)
For sec. 236-----	(25, 000, 000)
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50):	
Sec. 235-----	(50, 000, 000)
Sec. 236-----	(50, 000, 000)
House allowance:	
Sec. 235-----	(40, 000, 000)
Sec. 236-----	(40, 000, 000)
Committee recommendation:	
Sec. 235-----	(50, 000, 000)
Sec. 236-----	(50, 000, 000)

The committee recommends restoration of \$10 million in contract authority to provide the full amount of the supplemental request of \$50 million in contract authority for the homeownership assistance program under section 235 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 and a further restoration of \$10 million in contract authority to provide the full amount of the supplemental request of \$50 million in contract authority for rental housing assistance under section 236 of the act.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

PAYMENT OF PARTICIPATION SALES INSUFFICIENCIES

1969 appropriation-----	\$47, 638, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	4, 836, 000
House allowance-----	0
Committee recommendation-----	0

The committee concurs in the House denial of the budget estimate of \$4,836,000 for payment of participation sales insufficiencies until accurate determination can be made at the close of the fiscal year.

FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

1969 appropriation-----	\$2, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (House Doc. 91-50)-----	2, 000, 000
House allowance-----	0
Committee recommendation-----	1, 000, 000

The committee recommends restoration of \$1 million—a reduction of \$1 million from the supplemental estimate.

The committee has been advised that the funds will not be used to hire additional personnel but for educational and assistance efforts, directed to State and local bodies and to nongovernmental associations, to strengthen their capacity for carrying out a fair housing program.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$50, 751, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	12, 213, 000
House allowance-----	12, 213, 000
Committee recommendation-----	12, 213, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,213,000, including a transfer from the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of \$1,803,000. In addition, the committee recommends the release of \$275,000 from reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-364.

Of this amount, \$10,860,000 is to cover costs of emergency fire suppression and rehabilitation of burned-over lands during the 1968 fire season and similar anticipated expenses during the remainder of the current fiscal year; and \$1,628,000 is to meet increased pay and related costs as a result of Public Law 90-206.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$142, 145, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	5, 624, 000
House allowance-----	(1)
Committee recommendation-----	2, 781, 000

¹ Not considered.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,781,000 to meet unanticipated increases in the costs of general assistance grants and child welfare assistance in the social service program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Title III of this bill provides an increase of \$2,843,000 as well as a release of \$415,000 from reserves established by Public Law 90-364 to meet pay costs.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has overspent its appropriation for welfare and guidance services by an estimated \$2,781,000. In spite of the existence of committee directives requiring notice to and approval by the committee of reprogramming of funds, the committee was not aware of this overspending until the supplemental budget estimate was received as Senate Document 91-18, May 12, 1969. Failure by the Congress to approve this request will result, according to the Department of the Interior, in such actions as denial of adult vocational training grants, on-the-job training funds, rehabilitation of the Lewis and Clark Job Corps Center, housing improvements, adult education contracts, general assistance payments, and elimination of the law enforcement training program for June. Therefore, the committee does recommend this appropriation, but directs that specific safeguards be established in the Department of the Interior to avoid a future occurrence of this kind.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$50, 240, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	2, 769, 000
House allowance-----	2, 769, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 700, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,700,000 and a release of \$426,000 of reserves established pursuant to Public Law 90-364.

This amount will provide \$931,000 for suppression and emergency prevention of fires on forest range lands and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over areas, as well as anticipated costs of this nature during the remainder of this fiscal year; \$1,238,000 for increased pay

costs under Public Law 90-206; \$807,000 for wage board increases; and \$150,000 to provide an additional 75 million board feet of lumber to help relieve the timber shortage in the United States. By inclusion of appropriate language in the bill the latter sum is made available until September 30, 1969.

Officials of the Bureau of Indian Affairs indicated that the log export control act of last year is not applicable to timber harvested on Indian Reservations. It is also estimated that up to 5 million board feet to be harvested with the supplemental appropriation would enter the export market. Of the estimated 900 million board feet of timber harvested during 1968, about 130 million board feet were exported.

The committee has recommended an appropriation of the budget estimate of \$150,000 to increase timber production from Indian Reservations to ease the current timber shortage in the United States; however, the committee directs that this amount be so utilized that none of it contribute in any way to the harvest of logs or timber for export from the United States; and also directs that the Bureau of Indian Affairs establish appropriate requirements to prevent the use of any other appropriated funds to substitute for this appropriation so as to permit timber harvest for export.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

Appropriation out of the Fund (Liquidation of contract authorization)

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$46, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	19, 000, 000
House allowance-----	19, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	19, 000, 000

Advance appropriation

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$53, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	19, 000, 000
House allowance-----	19, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	None

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$19 million, the amount of the budget request and the House allowance, out of the land and water conservation fund to liquidate obligations resulting from the legislative taking of lands within the boundaries of Redwood National Park as authorized by Public Law 90-545, October 2, 1968.

The committee does not recommend an advance from the Treasury to the land and water conservation fund for this purpose. Public Law 90-401, July 15, 1968, provides that for each of the fiscal years 1969 through 1973, in addition to the sum of the revenues and collections covered into the fund under section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, there shall be placed in the fund an additional amount sufficient to make the income to the fund not less than \$200 million. The additional amount is to be derived either by direct appropriation or, absent that action, by transfer from the Outer Continental Shelf land receipts.

These assurances of a sufficient amount in the land and water conservation fund makes the advance appropriation unnecessary.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$13, 747, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	950, 000
House allowance-----	(¹)
Committee recommendation-----	950, 000

¹ Not considered.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$950,000, the amount of the budget estimate, to provide for the purchase and installation of a 3,000-kilowatt electrical generator for American Samoa. This equipment is necessary in order to meet an increasing power demand and to compensate for the recent failures of existing generating equipment.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$88, 675, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	¹ 2, 242, 000
House allowance-----	2, 092, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 242, 000

¹ \$150,000 not considered by House.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,242,000, the amount of the budget request. Of this appropriation, \$1,792,000 is to meet increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206; and \$450,000 is for the repair and replacement of stream-gaging facilities which were destroyed and damaged by the floods in southern and central California during the periods January 11 through January 27, 1969, and February 23 and 24, 1969.

BUREAU OF MINES

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$11, 237, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	1, 097, 000
House allowance-----	(¹)
Committee recommendation-----	750, 000

¹ Not considered.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$750,000 for the improvement of the Federal health and safety program for coal miners. The committee has approved in title III of this bill the transfer of \$347,000 to this activity from the "Solid Waste Disposal" appropriation. By appropriate language in the bill this appropriation is made available until September 30, 1969.

The amount recommended by the committee is for accelerating the hiring and training of coal and metal mine inspectors (\$130,000) and for accelerating research on dust production and control (\$320,000), for each of which funds have been included in the fiscal year 1970 budget. Availability of these funds now will permit earlier initiation of this vital work.

Also, the committee recommendation will provide \$300,000 for expenses in connection with preliminary work necessary for the establishment of an educational institute to provide professional training in health and safety.

HELIUM FUND

(Borrowing authorization)

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$16, 200, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	10, 000, 000
House allowance-----	5, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	10, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$10 million, the amount of the budget estimate and \$5 million more than the House allowance, for additional borrowing authority to finance purchases of helium which have already been contracted for by the fund. The additional sum is made necessary by a decline in revenues from helium sales and services. Inasmuch as payment on the contracts is due and must be made, and since the sums can be collected through court action, there is no economy in not providing the full amount of the budget estimate.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$819, 900
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	123, 000
House allowance-----	48, 000
Committee recommendation-----	48, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$48,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of Oil and Gas, to meet increased pay costs resulting from Public Law 90-206. This is the same amount as the House allowance and \$75,000 less than the budget estimate.

The committee concurs with the House Committee on Appropriations, as does the Oil Import Administration, that at this time in the fiscal year it will not be possible to employ the eight persons for which the \$75,000 was intended. Furthermore, these eight positions are already included in the fiscal year 1970 budget estimate which will be considered by this committee within the next few weeks.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND

Appropriation, 1969-----	None
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	\$60, 000
House allowance-----	60, 000
Committee recommendation-----	60, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$60,000, the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance, for the Fishermen's Protective Act, Public Law 90-482, August 12, 1968. This amount is necessary in order to implement the law which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements to indemnify the owners and crews of American fishing vessels unlawfully seized or detained by a foreign country.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$45, 893, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	1, 353, 000
House allowance-----	1, 353, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 353, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,353,000 and approves release of \$139,000 from reserves established by Public Law 90-364. This amount will provide \$250,000 to initiate a study of estuarine resources authorized by Public Law 90-454, August 3, 1968; and \$1,242,000 to meet increased pay costs under the provisions of Public Law 90-206. By inclusion of appropriate language in the bill the amount for study of estuarine resources is made available until September 30, 1969.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$1, 491, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	400, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 200, 000
Committee recommendation-----	400, 000

¹ \$200,000 not considered by House.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$400,000 to repair damage to six national wildlife refuges caused by floods in California during January and February of 1969; and to a railroad embankment on a wildlife refuge in North Dakota.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$43, 374, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	2, 479, 000
House allowance-----	2, 479, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 366, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,366,000, and the release of \$195,000 reserved under the provisions of Public Law 90-364. This amount will provide \$687,000 for actual and anticipated costs of emergency fire suppression and rehabilitation in national park areas during fiscal year 1969; \$1,652,000 to meet increases in classified pay costs under the provisions of Public Law 90-206; and \$222,000 to meet increased pay costs for U.S. Park Police under the provisions of Public Law 90-320.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$4, 368, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	1, 103, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 100, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 103, 000

¹ \$1,003,000 not considered by House.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,103,000. Of this amount, \$1,003,000 is for repair of buildings and utilities in National Park Service areas which have been damaged by floods, heavy snows, and storms since about November 1968. Repair of the damages is urgent in view of the approaching visitor season. The recommendation also includes \$100,000 to accomplish a study of suitable public visitor parking facilities in the vicinity of the Washington Channel in the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$243, 143, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	26, 716, 000
House allowance-----	26, 916, 000
Committee recommendation-----	26, 062, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$26,062,000 and release of \$1,676,000 reserved under the provisions of Public Law 90-364 for forest protection and utilization.

This appropriation will provide \$20,346,000 for fighting forest fires; \$6,932,000 for increased pay costs under Public Law 90-206; and \$460,000 for additional sale preparation of 270 million board feet of lumber from national forest land as part of the program to relieve the current timber shortage in the United States. By inclusion of appropriate language in the bill the latter sum is made available until September 30, 1969.

The committee directs that the Forest Service prepare designs for the sanitary system at Camp Horseshoe, Monongahela National Forest, in order that required corrective work can be scheduled for onstruction in fiscal year 1970.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$11, 500, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	3, 000, 000
House allowance-----	3, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	3, 000, 000

The committee recommends the appropriation of \$3 million requested by the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to provide Federal funds to match private gifts made to the two endowments of the Foundation. In order that this appropriation may be used, language has been included in the bill to provide that it will be available to match gifts received prior to September 1, 1969.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMAN

1969 appropriation-----	\$128, 200, 000
Supplemental budget estimate-----	20, 000, 000
House allowance-----	20, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	20, 000, 000

The committee recommends \$20 million, the full budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House.

These funds are used for payment of unemployed Federal workers and to unemployed ex-servicemen. The payment of these benefits is beyond administrative control, and the estimate is strictly mathematical calculations.

The Congress received a supplemental estimate in January of this year, an estimate reduced by the Bureau of the Budget from \$52 million sought by the Department to \$36 million, a reduction of \$16

million. Had the amount originally sought by the Department been submitted to the Congress, the Department would not have been required to return for a second supplemental in this fiscal year, inasmuch as the advance provision contained for several years in the appropriation act would have been used to secure the few million dollars needed.

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

1969 Appropriation.....	\$13, 000, 000
Supplemental Budget Estimate.....	0
House allowance.....	not considered
Committee recommendation.....	7, 500, 000

The committee recommends \$7,500,000. The Department did not submit a budget request and the House did not consider the item.

The committee allowance of an additional \$7,500,000 to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, is to be used for summer Neighborhood Youth Corps type programs. Funds can be obligated until September 30, 1969, under the terms of the item.

The Department received a direct appropriation of \$13,000,000 for this activity in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1968 (Public Law 90-392).

An additional amount of \$138,000,000 has been delegated to the Department by the Office of Economic Opportunity during the current fiscal year, for use in the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION CLAIMS AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation.....	\$52, 691, 000
Supplemental budget estimate.....	15, 900, 000
House allowance.....	15, 900, 000
Committee recommendation.....	15, 900, 000

The committee recommends approval of the House allowance of the full supplemental budget estimate, \$15,900,000, to provide a total of \$68,591,000 for the current fiscal year.

The Federal obligation for the payment of these statutory benefits are beyond administrative control, and whatever amount is required to meet these obligations must be provided.

Under this appropriation, benefits are paid to civil employees of the Government disabled in the performance of duty, or to their dependents, to dependents of certain reservists in the Armed Forces who die while on active military duty or while engaged in authorized training, to members of the Civil Air Patrol, and to others by various extensions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1969 appropriation.....	\$696, 307, 000
Supplemental budget estimate.....	11, 161, 000
House allowance.....	11, 161, 000
Committee recommendation.....	19, 920, 000

The committee recommends approval of \$19,920,000.

The committee has disallowed the funds sought, \$7,241,000, for payment to the Federal City College as authorized by the District of Columbia Public Education Act, Public Law 90-354, as a payment in lieu of a Federal land-grant to colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts, which designation was bestowed upon the college in the bill enacted last June. The school is not a college of agriculture and the mechanic arts, and further consideration should be given before the hasty appropriation of funds on the basis of such a qualification.

It should be pointed out that the State of Hawaii experienced some difficulty in obtaining the \$6 million authorized for them under the land-grant program. An initial estimate for \$6 million was reduced by the House to \$2,225,000, raised by the Senate to the full budget estimate of \$6 million; but the conference committee adopted the House allowance. In the succeeding year, no request for funds was presented by the Bureau of the Budget, and the House did not consider the item. The Senate did consider the item and added \$3,775,000, the balance of the authorization. The committee of conference approved the Senate allowance.

The \$3,920,000 approved is for interest subsidization grants to facilitate borrowing for construction by higher education institutions from non-Federal sources. The Department estimated that this sum would subsidize interest payments for one year on loans totaling \$145 million. The Committee has been advised by the Department that the recent increase in the prime rate to 8½ percent will reduce the amount of loans to \$137 million and will change the distribution between public and private institutions expected to participate in the program. Loans to public institutions will increase from \$84 million originally estimated to \$110 million; loans to private institutions will decrease from \$61 million to \$27 million. This estimate is based on the greater ability of public institutions to borrow funds through bond issues and other more attractive investment features. The enabling legislation authorizes the Secretary to pay interest in excess of 3 percent and does not place any limitation on the amount of interest that may be charged to the borrower. The committee is concerned that the Secretary and the Office of Education not permit exorbitant interest rates to be charged against institutions of higher learning and passed on to the Government under this program. The committee will expect the Secretary and the Commissioner to take appropriate steps pursuant to the authority vested in them under the statute to see that such interest rates do not exceed prevailing general interest rates charged for comparable loans and comparable risks. It is the sense of the committee that private lenders should not, under this program, charge rates higher than those that would be charged if the Federal Government were not making the subsidy.

The Committee has restored \$16,000,000 for educational opportunity grants. The 1969 regular appropriation request of \$140,600,000 was reduced by conference action to \$124,600,000. This restoration will increase the number of initial-year awards for the coming academic year from 100,200 under the currently available 1969 appropriation to 132,200. This compares with 140,500 first-year awards in 1968-69 academic year which was supported by the fiscal year 1968 appropriation.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

Comprehensive health planning and services

1969 appropriation.....	\$167, 104, 000
Supplemental budget estimate.....	9, 728, 000
House allowance.....	9, 728, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 728, 000

The committee recommends approval of the full budget estimate, \$9,728,000, as did the House of Representatives, with the addition of a proviso to make the funds available through September 30, 1969.

The Congress several years ago added funds, \$1 million, for the development of a vaccine for rubella, the German measles. The National Institutes of Health, and its grantees, fortunately developed an effective vaccine that is now ready for administration to about 2 million children at the outset, with 6 million additional to be vaccinated later. The committee was informed that the cost of each vaccine shot would be about \$2, the price of the shot for measles distributed under the authority of the Vaccination Assistance Act. The vaccine, the committee was informed, is safe, effective, and non-reactive when administered to susceptible children.

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

1969 appropriation.....	None
Supplemental budget estimate.....	\$15, 000, 000
House allowance.....	15, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	None

The committee recommends deletion of the account for the District of Columbia medical facilities from the bill, a reduction of \$15 million.

The committee considered the item proposing an allowance of \$15,000,000 for grants and loans to private, non-profit medical facilities, but in view of the fact that no hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Appropriations—the House had hearings but with respect to the item contained in the fiscal year 1970 budget estimate—but the first notice the committee had was the House report of May 15th, after hearings had been held on May 9th in the Senate.

The action of the committee was without prejudice.

The funds are required to pay for construction of facilities including obligations incurred prior to the enactment of the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968. The committee will fully acquaint itself with the need for these funds prior to the conference with the other body on the disagreeing votes on the bill.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

1969 appropriation.....	\$5, 765, 000, 000
Supplemental budget estimate.....	651, 546, 000
House allowance.....	651, 546, 000
Committee recommendation.....	651, 546, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$651,546,000, the full budget estimate and the House allowance.

The Congress received two estimates for this program, one for \$373,524,000 for grants to States for maintenance payments, and the other for \$278,022,000 for grants to States for medical assistance.

The Department advised the Congress that these two requests were in excess of needs by \$30 million. It was alleged though that another program for "Social services, administration, training, and demonstration projects" was in need of an additional \$30 million. No amendment of the budget estimate through the customary manner from the Bureau of the Budget was presented to the Congress. But the House allowed the full amount sought and merged the two appropriations for which supplemental estimates are pending, and added a third account, "Social services, administration, training, and demonstration projects." These three accounts for a number of years, up until the fiscal year 1969, were combined into a single account. The committee concurs in the action of the House.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES NATIONALS

1969 appropriation.....	\$545, 000
Supplemental estimate.....	100, 000
House allowance.....	100, 000
Committee recommendation.....	100, 000

The committee recommends approval of \$100,000, the amount of the budget estimate and the amount approved by the House.

This appropriation will provide temporary assistance to repatriated United States nationals returned from abroad because of destitution, illness, or international crises. The additional funds are requested to assist the United States nationals returning from Cuba under an agreement to permit one plane a month to repatriate U.S. citizens, and their dependents, with the stipulation that entry be made via Brownsville, Tex.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation.....	\$768, 145, 000
Supplemental budget estimate.....	16, 500, 000
House allowance.....	Not considered
Committee recommendation.....	21, 200, 000

The Senate received an estimate, Senate Document 91-18, not considered by the House, for \$16,500,000 for payment by the Social Security Administration to health insurance intermediaries for their work in administering the payment of benefits under medicare. The committee has approved the supplemental budget estimate in its entirety, plus an additional \$4,700,000, for a total of \$21,200,000, which the Social Security Administration advised the committee was required to fully reimburse the carriers and intermediaries for their work under contract with the Social Security Administration. There is, of course, no way to adjust the obligations which have been incurred under contract. The Commissioner of Social Security had indicated to this committee in his appearance on May 9, 1969, that the estimate of \$16,500,000 might be insufficient to meet the Federal obligations.

In this case, the committee is distressed at the lack of interest evidenced by the Bureau of the Budget in processing an estimate

for this additional money required for administrative purposes. A letter was brought to the committee on May 23, 1969, stating that a determination had been made by the Department that \$4,700,000 additional was needed and that the Bureau of the Budget was in concurrence with this determination. The committee directed the Department to discuss the matter further with the Bureau of the Budget to see if a supplemental estimate could be submitted officially requesting the additional sum.

The committee understood that the Budget Bureau had agreed to submit an estimate for this additional sum. But a day or two later the committee was advised that it would be impossible to process such an estimate. It appears further that the Department budget office has acted with less than alacrity in processing the estimate.

Notwithstanding the lack of an estimate for this additional sum due to the seeming lack of interest in the Department and in the Bureau of the Budget, the committee has approved \$21,200,000, the amount of the estimate, \$16,500,000, plus \$4,700,000 later determined to be needed.

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

The committee recommends the sum of \$156,900 for the Senate items contained in this title of the bill, of which \$30,000 represents the payment to the widow of the late Senator from Alaska, the Honorable E. L. Bartlett, and the balance, \$126,900, is the amount required to meet obligations incurred in fiscal year 1968 under the appropriation, "Inquiries and investigations." This deficit was occasioned by the increased expenditure rate by Senate committees as a result of additional investigations authorized in various Senate resolutions in fiscal year 1968.

Additionally, because of population increases in the States of Illinois and Texas, the committee has included language in the bill, authorizing the payment of increased allowances to Senators from these two States under the head, "Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators." The committee was advised that actual funds are not needed in this account for the balance of this fiscal year, but the authority is herewith provided to accomplish the purpose in this and succeeding fiscal years.

INCREASED PAY COSTS

As is customary, the House did not consider the budget estimates for increased pay costs for items disbursed by the Senate and the Senate items (Senate Office Buildings and Senate garage) under the Architect of the Capitol. These budget estimates total \$3,397,602 (in title III) and are detailed in the tabulation at the conclusion of the report.

For the Senate items disbursed by the financial clerk of the Senate, the committee recommends \$2,699,602, a reduction of \$517,500 from the budget estimates due to absorptions in the accounts, "Salaries, officers and employees," and "Miscellaneous items" determined to be feasible after further evaluation. The funds, in the amount of \$180,500, requested for the Senate Office Buildings and Senate garage accounts are mandatory, and are included under the Architect of the Capitol.

CHAPTER IX

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

Flood control and coastal emergencies

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$5, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	25, 000, 000
House allowance-----	Not considered
Committee recommendation-----	25, 000, 000

The committee recommends \$25 million, the budget estimate, for flood control and coastal emergencies.

Public Law 99 of the 84th Congress authorized the flood control and coastal emergency activities of the Corps of Engineers. These activities include: flood emergency preparations; flood fighting and rescue operations; emergency repair and restoration of flood control works threatened or destroyed by flood. The authorized emergency work is financed from an emergency fund authorized by Public Law 99 in the amount of \$15 million, to be replenished on an annual basis.

The subtropical storms and heavy rains along the California coast in January and February of this year, as well as the extraordinarily heavy snowpack in the north central portion of the country which, together with the spring rains, produced unusually severe flooding, necessitated expenditures for emergency operations, which, as of May 31, 1969, created a deficit of \$25,290,000 in the emergency fund. As authorized by Public Law 99, the money required to meet these emergencies in excess of the balance in the emergency fund was allocated from appropriations made for the construction of flood control projects throughout the country. The appropriation recommended is urgently needed to replace the funds reallocated from construction projects underway.

With the appropriation recommended, there will still be a deficit of \$290,000 in the flood control and coastal emergency fund with no reserve to meet any requirements that may arise during the June flood season in the Upper Missouri River Basin and in the Columbia River Basin, as well as any flash floods resulting from local storms during the remainder of fiscal year 1969.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$461, 574, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-21)-----	45, 000, 000
House allowance-----	Not considered
Committee recommendation-----	45, 000, 000

The committee recommends \$45 million, the budget estimate for the plant and capital equipment account of the Atomic Energy Commission.

These funds are urgently needed to restore or replace the weapons production facility at Rocky Flats, Colo., which was extensively damaged by fire on May 11, 1969.

The urgency of this appropriation is to provide the obligational authority required to award contracts for equipment and for the repair of the damaged facility as quickly as possible.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

1969 appropriation-----	\$6, 285, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-98)-----	¹ 127, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 65, 000
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 65, 000

¹ Plus \$233,000 of reserves released and transferred for pay increases (\$231,000 from LEAA and \$2,000 from Community Relations Service).

The committee has approved the House allowance of \$65,000, a reduction of \$62,000 below the supplemental estimate. Of the amount recommended \$40,000 is to cover the costs of 11 new positions for the data processing project in the customs section of the Civil Division, and \$25,000 is for executive pay level increases. In addition the committee recommends language in the bill authorizing the transfer of \$233,000 to cover Pay Act costs and wage board increases. Also language has been included to extend availability of the \$40,000 allowed for new positions to September 30, 1969.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

1969 appropriation-----	\$23, 598, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-98)-----	¹ 1, 667, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 1, 314, 000
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 1, 277, 000

¹ Plus \$100,000 of reserves transferred from LEAA and \$100,000 of reserves released from this account for pay increases.

The committee recommends the allowance of \$1,277,000, a reduction of \$390,000 in the supplemental budget estimate and \$37,000 under the House bill. Of the the amount recommended, \$101,000 is to provide for personnel compensation and related benefits for the 30 positions for the Tax Division, 18 for the Criminal Division, and 30 for the Civil Rights Division. Of the balance of the amount allowed, \$840,000 is for classified employee pay increases, \$38,000 is for executive pay level increases, and \$298,000 is for revised standards of attorney positions, authorized by the Civil Service Commission in September 1968. The committee has also approved language inserted in the bill by the House providing an additional \$100,000 to be derived by transfer and for the release of \$100,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364 to defray costs of the Pay Act. Also, language has been included to extend the availability of the \$101,000 allowed for new positions to September 30, 1969.

During the hearings the committee was informed that the Civil Rights Division has been instructed by the Attorney General to develop a strong program looking toward the vigorous prosecution of dissidents on college campuses whose actions interfere with a federally conducted or funded program or with the civil rights of nondissident students or faculty members, as authorized by title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, Public Law 90-284. Accordingly, the committee in recommending additional positions for this Division expects that the authority contained in title I will be utilized to the fullest extent.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

1969 appropriation-----	\$7, 991, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-98)-----	¹ 99, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 99, 000
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 99, 000

¹ Plus \$352,000 of reserves released and transferred for pay increases, (\$262,000 from LEAA and \$90,000 from this account).

For the Antitrust Division, the committee recommends \$99,000, the supplemental estimate and the House allowance. Of the sum recommended, \$5,000 is for executive pay level increases and \$94,000 is for revised standards of attorney positions. The committee has approved language in the bill providing for an additional \$262,000 to be derived by transfer and the release of \$90,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364 for Pay Act increases.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, U.S. ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

1969 appropriation-----	\$39, 876, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-98)-----	¹ 2, 833, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 2, 505, 000
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 2, 505, 000

¹ Plus \$150,000 of reserves released in this account for pay increases.

For U.S. attorneys and marshals, the committee concurs with the House allowance of \$2,505,000, a reduction of \$328,000 in the budget estimate. Of the sum recommended, \$162,000 is to provide for personnel compensation and related benefits for 43 assistant U.S. attorneys, 43 clerical positions, and 30 additional deputy marshals; \$23,000 for executive pay level increases; \$175,000 for revised standards of assistant U.S. attorneys and deputy marshals; \$1,445,000 for classified employee pay costs; \$300,000 for increased volume and cost of transcripts; and \$400,000 for premium pay, overtime costs and guard hire. In addition, the committee recommends language in the bill providing for the release of \$150,000 reserved pursuant to section 201, Public Law 90-364, for increased pay costs. Also, language has been included to extend the availability of the \$162,000 allowed for new positions to September 30, 1969.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

1969 appropriation-----	\$65, 388, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	¹ 2, 319, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 2, 319, 000
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 2, 319, 000

¹ Plus \$250,000 of reserves released in this account for pay increases.

The committee concurs with the House in allowing the full budget estimate of \$2,319,000 for this item, of which \$1,842,000 is for pay costs and \$477,000 is for increased costs of operating Federal correctional institutions. In addition, the committee has approved language in the bill providing for the release of \$250,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364. The amounts recommended will provide for keeping a larger than anticipated number of prisoners confined in Federal institutions and will also cover increased pay costs for classified employees.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

1969 appropriation-----	\$4, 900, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-98)-----	2, 500, 000
House allowance-----	2, 500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 500, 000

For support of U.S prisoners, the committee recommends \$2,500,000 the budget estimate and the House allowance. The supplemental estimate is to cover the cost of keeping a larger than anticipated number of prisoners in non-Federal institutions and also to cover increased daily rates charged by such institutions.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation-----	\$17, 380, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	¹ 1, 422, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 1, 187, 000
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 1, 187, 000

¹ Plus \$400,000 of reserves released in this account for pay increases.

For the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the committee recommends the House allowance of \$1,187,000, a reduction of \$235,000 below the supplemental estimate. Of the sum recommended, \$188,000 is to provide for personnel compensation and related benefits for 60 new field agents and 23 clerical personnel; \$512,000 for new laboratory equipment; \$37,000 for radio communications equipment, and \$450,000 for pay act costs. In addition, the committee has approved language in the bill providing for the release of \$400,000 reserved under section 201 of Public Law 90-364 for pay act costs. Also, language has been included to extend the availability of the \$188,000 allowed for new positions, the \$512,000 allowed for new laboratory equipment, and the \$37,000 for radio communications equipment, to September 30, 1969.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

1969 appropriation-----	\$19, 740, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	¹ (116, 000)
House allowance-----	¹ (116, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	¹ (116, 000)

¹ Language to reduce from \$2,000,000 to \$1,200,000 in the amount which may be advanced from this appropriation to the Small Business Administration for loan processing services and release of reserves in this account for increased pay costs in the amount of \$116,000.

The committee recommends language included in the bill by the House to reduce from \$2 million to \$1,200,000 the amount which is required to be advanced from this appropriation to the Small Business Administration for loan processing services. The committee received testimony that the Small Business Administration concurs with the recommended language. The bill contains language providing for the release of \$116,000 pursuant to section 201, Public Law 90-364, to defray pay act costs.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation-----	\$115, 000, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	¹ (147, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	¹ (147, 000)

¹ Increase language limitation of \$1,027,000 in regular 1969 act for retired pay of commissioned officers by \$147,000, under authority of Public Law 90-207.

The committee has approved the supplemental request submitted in Senate Document 91-18 to increase the limitation contained in the regular 1969 appropriation act, Public Law 90-470 so as to increase by \$147,000 the amount available for retirement pay of commissioned officers and payments under the retired serviceman's family protection plan. The increase is requested because of an unanticipated rise in the number of retirees and a 3.9 percent increase in the amount payable to such retirees.

Language to effectuate the recommendation follows:

*ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION*

Salaries and Expenses

In addition to the amount made available in the appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1969, for retirement pay of commissioned officers and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan, \$147,000 shall be available in that appropriation for such expenses.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

1969 appropriation-----	\$1, 900, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	¹ (210, 000)
House allowance-----	¹ (210, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	¹ (210, 000)

¹ Language requested to transfer \$210,000 from regular 1969 appropriation for "Ship Construction," administrative and warehouse activity.

The committee has approved language included in the bill by the House which authorizes the transfer of \$210,000 from the regular 1969 appropriation for "Ship construction," administrative and warehouse activity to meet the payment of allowances to cadets in State marine schools. The additional sum results from unanticipated increases in enrollment.

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

1968 appropriation-----	\$155, 000
1969 appropriation-----	155, 000
1968 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	10, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	27, 000
House allowance (1968—\$10,000) (1969—\$27,000)-----	37, 000
Committee recommendation-----	37, 000

The committee agrees to the House allowance of \$10,000 for fiscal year 1968 to liquidate obligations incurred with the Government Printing Office for printing opinions of the Court for the October 1967 term. Also, the supplemental request for \$27,000 for the fiscal year 1969 to cover the increased costs of printing and binding the United States Reports for the October 1968 term.

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation-----	\$1, 600, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	155, 850
House allowance-----	113, 000
Committee recommendation-----	113, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$113,000 additional funds for fiscal year 1969. This sum will provide \$92,900 for increased pay costs (includes \$31,000 for executive pay increases), and \$20,100 for salaries of temporary and part-time employees currently needed in the Customs Court to help cope with the increased caseload.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF JUDGES

1969 appropriation-----	\$16, 795, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	2, 075, 000
House allowance-----	1, 975, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 948, 000

The committee recommends the allowance of \$1,948,000 in additional funds needed for "Salaries of judges" in the current fiscal year. This sum includes \$1,830,000 for increased pay costs of judges; \$93,000 for compensation and related benefits for three additional senior judges; and \$25,000 for salaries of new circuit judges appointed pursuant to Public Law 90-347.

SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

1969 appropriation-----	\$43, 500, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	2, 865, 000
House allowance-----	2, 412, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 412, 000

For "Salaries of supporting personnel," the committee agrees with the House allowance of \$2,412,000 in additional funds for fiscal 1969. This sum will provide \$2,165,000 for increased pay costs; \$42,000 for salaries of secretaries and law clerks to the new circuit judges; \$130,000 for reclassification of law clerk and crier-law clerk positions, pursuant to Civil Service Commission revision of standards for Federal attorneys, and adoption thereof by the Judicial Conference of the United State; and \$75,000 for costs and related benefits of 83 additional deputy clerks needed to help administer the new random jury selection process, authorized by Public Law 90-274, and for other high-priority programs existing in District offices with heavy workloads.

Language has been added to the bill to provide that \$205,000 of the allowance remain available for obligation until September 30, 1969.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

1968 appropriation-----	3, 150, 000
1969 appropriation-----	3, 150, 000
1968 supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	850, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	850, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 700, 000

The committee has approved the supplemental request included in Senate Document 91-18 in the total amount of \$1,700,000 and representing \$850,000 for each of the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 that will be required to liquidate obligations incurred for the representation of criminal defendants under the Criminal Justice Act of 1964 (18 U.S.C. 3006A).

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

1969 appropriation-----	\$6, 450, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	525, 000
House allowance-----	400, 000
Committee recommendation-----	400, 000

For this item, the committee agrees to the House allowance of \$400,000 for travel and miscellaneous expenses. The sum is necessary to defray the \$150,000 expenses incident to the appointment of the nine new circuit judges, and \$250,000 for costs relating to administration of the new jury system.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

1969 appropriation-----	\$1, 846, 500
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	¹ 141, 500
House allowance-----	¹ 97, 500
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 97, 500

¹ Plus \$10,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation Expenses of Referees."

The committee agrees with the House allowance of \$97,500 to cover the costs (\$10,000) of five additional positions on a 1 month's basis, and \$87,500 for pay act increases. Also approved is language to transfer under this head \$10,000 from the appropriation "Expenses of referees," and language to provide that the \$10,000 allowed for additional positions remain available for obligation until September 30, 1969.

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$10, 050, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-18)-----	4, 634, 000
House allowance-----	Not considered
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 2, 000, 000

¹ And \$100,000 in title III for increased pay costs.

The committee considered a supplemental budget estimate of \$4,634,000, to remain available until June 30, 1971, for costs associated with the move of units of the Department of Transportation to the Nassif Building in Southwest, Washington, D.C. This request was not considered by the House.

The budget request for space consolidation fell into three major categories: (1) space acquisition costs, \$2,591,000; (2) one-time costs related to consolidation, \$1,377,000; and, (3) first-year costs—continuing requirements, \$666,000. During the course of the committee questioning, it was revealed that \$2 million would enable the Department of Transportation to fund the move until the end of the calendar year 1969.

The committee, therefore, recommends \$2 million to meet the 1969 calendar year requirement. In addition, this would permit the regular Transportation subcommittee to examine the remaining requirements

The recommended \$2 million, to remain available until December 31, 1969, would provide a net of \$200,000 for space occupancy costs and \$1,800,000 for other consolidation costs.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$4, 500, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	298, 000
House allowance-----	¹ 298, 000
Committee recommendation-----	¹ 298, 000

¹ And release of \$28,000 from reserves.

An additional \$148,000 is required because of the increased frequency of significant aircraft accidents in fiscal year 1969, and \$150,000 for increased pay costs. In fiscal year 1968, the National Transportation Safety Board investigated 11 major aircraft accidents. Thus far, in fiscal year 1969, 24 aircraft accidents have required the initiation of 24 in-depth investigations. The safety board must also be prepared to handle additional investigations in this fiscal year. In light of the above factors, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$298,000, which includes \$150,000 for increased pay costs.

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

Appropriation, 1969-----	\$51, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-50)-----	2, 300, 000
House allowance-----	2, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 000, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$2 million for this appropriation, for which \$2,300,000 had originally been requested in the supplemental budget estimate. Testimony revealed that, due to a fewer number of voluntary retirements than expected during 1969, \$2 million would fulfill retired pay requirements. Cost-of-living increases are adjusted pursuant to the provisions of section 1401(a) of title 10, United States Code.

INCREASED PAY COSTS

Title III (increased pay costs) includes \$41,342,000 (new budget authority) for Department of Transportation items. In addition, the bill provides for release of \$954,000 in Public Law 90-364 reserves.

The following summarizes the estimates and the House version of the bill, from which no appeal was made:

	Budget estimate	House version of the bill and Senate committee recommendation
New budget authority-----	\$42, 802, 000	\$41, 342, 000
Release of reserves-----	(1, 120, 000)	(954, 000)
Limitation on administrative expenses (increase)-----	(1, 875, 000)	(875, 000)

CHAPTER XII

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

1969 appropriation.....	\$56, 900, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-50).....	1, 978, 000
House allowance.....	1, 978, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 978, 000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending the full amount of the request for supplemental funds in the amount of \$1,978,000, together with the release of \$334,000 of funds held in reserve.

The funds allowed provide \$572,000 for increased payments to banks and other paying agents who redeem savings-type securities on behalf of the Federal Government, and \$863,000 for increased reimbursable operating costs of Federal Reserve banks acting as fiscal agents for the Bureau of the Public Debt. The amount recommended also provides for \$543,000 in budget authority and \$334,000 in release of reserves for increased pay and related costs under Public Law 90-206.

U.S. SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation.....	\$20, 900, 000
Supplemental request (S. Doc. 91-18).....	¹ 470, 000
House allowance.....	Not considered
Committee recommendation.....	470, 000

¹ This amount is in addition to \$1,338,000 requested for increased pay costs in H. Doc. 91-50, and approved by the House under title III of H. R. 11400.

The committee recommends the budget estimate of \$470,000 for activities under this head. The request for this amount was contained in Senate Document No. 91-18, dated May 12, 1969, and was not considered by the House.

Testimony before the Senate revealed that past estimates, projections, evaluations, and judgments of the Service were incorrect because of (1) new and unanticipated responsibilities assigned the Service in connection with the protection of persons determined to be major Presidential or Vice Presidential candidates, and (2) lack of adequate information and in-depth knowledge of what to expect from all concerned. Consequently, the Service's financial estimates have fallen significantly short of actual need, and require supplemental funds in the amount herein recommended.

Thus in recommending the amount requested, the committee directs that the Secret Service secure the assistance of the General Accounting Office with a view to providing better management and financial control. In addition, the committee urges that better coordination and understanding be developed between the Secret Service and cooperating agencies to facilitate better forecasts and accounting of funding arrangements.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation-----	\$1, 030, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	107, 000
House allowance-----	107, 000
Committee recommendation-----	100, 000

The committee recommends the amount of \$100,000, a reduction of \$7,000 in the estimate and House allowance, for activities under this head.

Of the \$100,000 recommended, \$58,000 is for increased economic studies and support of the activities of the President's Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy, \$31,000 is for increased pay under Public Law 90-206, and \$11,000 is to fund the new executive pay increase. The reduction is a result of the time that has elapsed since submission of the estimate.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1969 appropriation-----	\$664, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-94)-----	200, 000
House allowance-----	200, 000
Committee recommendation-----	147, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$147,000, a reduction of \$53,000 under the estimate and House allowance, for activities under this head.

Of the reduction imposed, \$40,000 is applied to the request for funds for reimbursement of eight professional employees on detail from NSC member agencies. The committee was requested by the Council to lapse this amount as the Council's operation will obviously not be impaired since it has, in fact, already received the services and the employees have been, and will continue to be, funded by the member agencies through the balance of the fiscal year.

In the main, the remainder of the reduction is simply a result of the date of enactment of the bill. In the total amount requested under this head there was included the amount of \$45,500 for 13 additional employees lapsed on the basis of an assumed May 1 entry on duty. Accordingly, the amount requested for permanent salaries has been seduced because of the delay in hiring and the time that has elapsed since the formulation and submission of the estimate.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

The committee recommends the amount of \$18,188,688 for claims and judgments, which is the full amount of the budget estimate, but \$1,307,876 over the House-passed bill. These funds are provided for the mandatory payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies of the Federal Government in accord with the law; and judgments rendered against the United States by the U.S. Court of Claims and the U.S. district courts.

The increase of \$1,307,876 included by the Senate committee resulted from the submissions directly to the Senate of Senate Document No. 91-18, dated May 12, 1969, and Senate Document No. 22 dated June 9, 1969. Details of the other claims and judgments funded in this bill may be determined from House Document No. 91-101, submitted to the House of Representatives on April 15, 1969.

TITLE III

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For pay increases and related costs, the Bureau of the Budget estimated the total cost to the Federal Government for fiscal year 1969 to be \$2,087 million. This results from a variety of public laws, which are enumerated in the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget before the subcommittee. A total of \$487 million, or 23.3 percent, was absorbed from available funds, leaving a balance of \$1,600 million in additional supplemental funds required. Included within the \$487 million of absorptions is \$191 million requiring congressional approval, including \$78 million reserved under Public Law 90-364, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

A tabulation of the supplemental appropriations requested and allowances by the House and Senate committee follows:

	Budget authority requested	In House bill	Senate committee recommendation	Increase
Title II.....	\$135, 378, 400	\$116, 435, 400	\$124, 846, 400	+\$8, 411, 000
Title III.....	1, 464, 734, 396	1, 183, 298, 454	1, 368, 137, 556	+184, 839, 102
Total.....	1, 600, 112, 796	1, 299, 733, 854	1, 492, 983, 956	+193, 250, 102

The individual pay cost increases and decreases in the House bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

Title II:

Department of Defense:	
New Budget authority.....	+\$800, 000
By transfer.....	(+2, 600, 000)
Veterans' Administration.....	+7, 611, 000
Total, title II.....	+8, 411, 000

Title III:

Senate.....	+2, 880, 102
General Accounting Office.....	-100, 000
Department of Agriculture.....	-300, 000
Department of Defense:	
Military functions.....	+182, 200, 000
By transfer.....	(+3, 600, 000)
Civil functions.....	(+100, 000)
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	(+4, 000)
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.....	9, 000
National Labor Relations Board.....	150, 000
Total, title III.....	184, 839, 102
Grand total, new budget authority.....	193, 250, 102
Grand total, by transfer & release of reserve.....	6, 304, 000

It will be observed from the foregoing tabulations that pay cost increases are included in some instances in title II of the bill and in other cases in title III of the bill. It is confusing, in examining an individual account, to be confronted with this situation. It is recommended that in the future all pay cost items be included in one separate title.

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 OUTLAYS

The committee has deleted from the bill the provision on limitation of 1970 outlays inserted by the House committee and has placed in the bill an entirely new provision.

Under the committee recommendation, the limitation on fiscal year 1970 outlays would be set at \$187.9 billion, which compares with President Nixon's revised budget figure of \$192.9 billion. However, the committee provision also contains language which would exempt from the limitation so-called uncontrollable outlays to the extent that these outlays in fiscal year 1970 exceed outlays in fiscal year 1969. The committee desires to make it entirely clear that the limitation, because of the exemption, may be exceeded by \$3.1 billion. It is estimated that \$3.1 billion is the amount social security, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions, public assistance grants, farm price supports, special support of Southeast Asia, and other uncontrollable items in 1970 exceed comparable figures for 1969. On the other hand, if these increases do not materialize, the limitation could not be exceeded otherwise. The increase of \$3.1 billion in uncontrollable items in fiscal year 1970 over comparable items for fiscal year 1969 is a net figure.

While a ceiling of \$187.9 billion is \$5 billion less than the revised budget, the committee wishes to point out that the savings may or may not be this large because of these exemptions. However, even with these estimated increases for the exemptions, the ceiling would be \$1.9 billion under the House ceiling and the revised budget, and at least this amount would be saved under the committee recommendation.

It is most difficult to estimate figures for these uncontrollable items. The January budget had certain figures which were revised by better information in the April 15 review. The committee has been advised that the April 15 review figures are in line for another revision. In view of the fact that it is extremely difficult to make firm estimates in this regard, the committee has recommended as a base for comparison for uncontrollable items the figures for fiscal year 1969, since these figures are now almost firm.

The House provision which was stricken by the committee set a limitation on fiscal year 1970 outlays in the amount of the new President Nixon budget of \$192.9 billion. This figure would increase or decrease, depending upon the action or inaction of the Congress on the appropriation bills and other proposals. Under the committee recommendation, a definite reduction of at least \$1.9 billion has been recommended which will serve as an incentive to reduce the appropriation bills by at least this amount. The language recommended by the committee reads as follows:

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 OUTLAYS

"SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$187,900,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount shall be increased or decreased by the aggregate amount by which the sum expenditures and net lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser than the sum of expenditures and net lending in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for—

"(1) items designated "Open-ended programs and fixed costs" in the table appearing on page 16 of the Budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document No. 91-15, Part I, 91st Congress);

"(2) the item designated "Special Southeast Asia support" in the table appearing on page 27 of that Budget; and

"(3) programs of aid to schools in Federally-impacted areas, under the Acts of September 23 and September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C., chs. 13 and 19).

"(b) The President shall reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations or other obligational authority heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available (including amounts made available to carry out programs to which title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments is applicable), such amounts as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of subsection (a).

"Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1,900,000,000 in expenditures and net lending, below the amounts recommended in the April review of the 1970 Budget, for programs other than those designated in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

"(c) In the administration of any program as to which—

"(1) the amount of expenditures or net lending is limited pursuant to subsection (a), and

"(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution, the amount available for expenditure or obligation (as determined by the President) shall be substituted, in the application of the formula, for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available."

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

REPEAL OF LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

The committee has inserted the following language in the bill:

SEC. 503. Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-364, approved June 28, 1968) is hereby repealed.

The purpose of this amendment is to repeal section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-364), which in essence provides that only three out of four vacancies in the executive branch may be filled, until the June 30, 1966, level of employment has been reached for the entire Federal Government.

Furthermore, the provision requires that Federal employment be *maintained* at that June 1966 level.

Subsequently, the Congress exempted certain agencies and programs from the application of this section.

Testimony before the committee on the present bill convinced the committee that the provision, which was designed to promote economy and efficiency in Government, has had the reverse effect—it is extravagant in its impact and too rigid for the effective utilization of manpower.

In the case of the Social Security Administration, employee overtime has had to be substituted for regular time in order to meet the increasing workloads. The statement was made that it has cost roughly \$6 million more in fiscal year 1969 to process the work done on overtime than if that work had been performed on a regular-time basis. Additionally, some important purchases have had to be postponed and certain activities deferred to meet the stringencies imposed by the employee limitation.

The experience of the Treasury Department has been similar. Testimony in the hearings indicated that the Bureau of Customs, because of insufficient manpower, has been unable to examine all mailed packages, which has resulted in an estimated loss of between \$30-to-\$40 million in revenue. The Internal Revenue Service reports there has been an estimated revenue loss in fiscal year 1969 of \$500 million, and in the event the restrictions are not lifted for fiscal year 1970, the total loss might be as high as \$1 billion.

Other examples of the undesirable, and unanticipated, effects of the personnel restrictions are cited in the committee hearings, and attention is called particularly to the testimony of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

On May 27, 1969, the House of Representatives passed two appropriation bills for fiscal year 1970—the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill and the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, and executive office appropriation bill—which contained similar provisions, removing the agencies covered in these bills, for fiscal year 1970 *only*, from the personnel limitations imposed by section 201. These bills have been referred to the Senate committee and are now receiving the attention of the subcommittees having jurisdiction.

It is the committee's view that the application of section 201 of Public Law 90-364 has resulted in the ineffective deployment of personnel, inefficient use of overtime, the interruption or curtailment of essential services, and costly losses in revenue expected in several areas of the Government's operations during the fiscal year.

The committee recommends, therefore, that section 201 be repealed outright, and permanently, rather than on a departmental or yearly basis, and has thus inserted language in the accompanying bill to accomplish this purpose.

The provision to be repealed reads as follows:

SEC. 201. LIMITATION ON THE NUMBER OF CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section—

(1) No person shall be appointed as a full-time civilian employee to a permanent position in the executive branch during any month when the number of such employees is greater than the number of such employees on June 30, 1966.

(2) The number of temporary and part-time employees in any department or agency in the executive branch during any month shall not be greater than the number of such employees during the corresponding month of 1967.

(b)(1) During any period when appointments are otherwise prohibited under subsection (a)(1), the head of any department or agency may, except as otherwise provided in this subsection, appoint a number of persons as full-time civilian employees in permanent positions in such department or agency equal to 75 percent of the number of vacancies in such positions which have occurred during such period by reason of resignation, retirement, removal, or death.

(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), all agencies which, on the first day of any period when appointments are otherwise prohibited under subsection (a)(1), have 50 or fewer full-time civilian employees in permanent positions shall be treated as one agency, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Director") shall determine the vacancies in each such agency which may be filled by reason of paragraph (1).

(3) For purposes of paragraph (1), the Director may reassign vacancies from one department or agency to another department or agency when such reassignment is, in the opinion of the Director, necessary or appropriate because of the creation of a new department or agency, because of a change in functions, or for the more efficient operation of the Government.

(4) If a full-time civilian employee in a permanent position is transferred from one department or agency to another department or agency—

(A) such transfer shall be taken into account under paragraph (1) as an appointment by the head of the department or agency to which he transfers, and

(B) subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to an appointment to the vacancy in the department or agency from which he transferred and such vacancy shall not be taken into account under paragraph (1).

(c) For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the Director may reassign authorized temporary and part-time employment from one department or agency to another department or agency when such reassignment is, in the opinion of the Director, necessary or appropriate because of the creation of a new department or agency, because of a change in functions, or for the more efficient operation of the Government.

(d) For purposes of this section, there shall not be taken into account—

(1) any position filled by appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, other than for purposes of determining under subsection (a)(1) the number of full-time

civilian employees in permanent positions in the executive branch at any time,

(2) casual employees or employees serving without compensation, and

(3) those employees (not exceeding 70,000 during any month) appointed under the President's program to provide summer employment for economically or educationally disadvantaged persons between the ages of 16 and 22.

(e) The Director shall maintain a continuous study of all appropriations and contract authorizations in relation to personnel employed and shall reserve from expenditure the savings in salaries and wages resulting from the operation of this section, and any savings in other categories of expense which he determines will result from such operation.

(f) The departments and agencies in the executive branch shall submit to the Director such information as may be necessary to enable him to carry out his functions under this section.

(g) The Director shall submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the end of each calendar quarter, beginning with the quarter ending September 30, 1968, a report on the operation of this section.

(h) Nothing in this section shall supersede or modify the reemployment rights of any person under section 9 of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 or any other provision of law conferring reemployment rights upon persons who have performed active duty in the Armed Forces.

(i) The Director shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.

(j) This section (other than subsection (i)) shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

VALIDATING CLAUSE

The following provision which will authorize obligation of funds for 5 days following the date of approval of this act, together with language validating obligations incurred in anticipation of this act, has been included in the bill by the committee. This provision is necessary in view of the delay in this bill.

A similar provision was contained in the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1968, a year ago.

The provision reads as follows:

Section 504. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1969, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1969 or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: Provided, That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appropriations and authority for the fiscal year 1969 as well as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I—MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY					
	MILITARY PERSONNEL					
91-04	Military personnel, Army.....	\$136,200,000	\$110,000,000	\$110,000,000	—\$26,200,000	-----
91-04	Military personnel, Navy.....	21,500,000	14,500,000	21,500,000	-----	+\$7,000,000
91-04	Military personnel, Air Force.....	146,000,000	115,000,000	146,000,000	-----	+\$1,000,000
	Total, military personnel.....	303,700,000	239,500,000	277,500,000	—26,200,000	+\$8,000,000
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
91-04	Operation and maintenance, Army.....	144,600,000	96,310,000	96,310,000	—48,290,000	-----
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps.....	24,300,000	15,390,000	15,390,000	—8,910,000	-----
	<i>By transfer</i>	-----	-----	(8,910,000)	(+8,910,000)	(+8,910,000)
91-04	Operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	307,300,000	242,700,000	242,700,000	—64,600,000	-----
	Total, operation and maintenance.....	476,200,000	354,400,000	354,400,000	—121,800,000	-----
	<i>By transfer</i>	-----	-----	(8,910,000)	(+8,910,000)	(+8,910,000)
	PROCUREMENT					
91-04	Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army.....	717,000,000	640,100,000	640,100,000	—76,900,000	-----
	Total, title I, military operations in Southeast Asia, Department of Defense, military.....	1,496,900,000	1,234,000,000	1,272,000,000	—224,900,000	+\$8,000,000
	<i>By transfer</i>	-----	-----	(8,910,000)	(+8,910,000)	(+8,910,000)

TITLE II

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
CHAPTER I						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE						
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000		
EXTENSION SERVICE						
91-94	Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses.....	218,000	218,000	218,000		
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE						
S. Doc. 91-18	Flood prevention.....	4,000,000		4,000,000		+\$4,000,000
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE						
91-50	Sugar Act program.....	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000		
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION						
	Emergency credit revolving fund.....		(Language)	(Language)		
	Total, chapter I: New budget (obligational) authority.....	13,118,000	9,118,000	13,118,000		+4,000,000
CHAPTER II						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY						
MILITARY PERSONNEL						
91-50	Reserve personnel, Navy.....	8,500,000	4,150,000	4,150,000	-\$4,350,000	
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....	(3,500,000)	(3,150,000)	(3,150,000)	(-\$350,000)	
91-94	Reserve personnel, Marine Corps.....	6,800,000	4,500,000	6,400,000	-400,000	+1,900,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....	(1,600,000)	(800,000)	(1,600,000)		(+800,000)

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-50	CHAPTER II—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY—Continued					
	MILITARY PERSONNEL—Continued					
	Retired pay, Defense.....	\$175,000,000 (18,000,000)	\$175,000,000 (18,000,000)	\$175,000,000 (18,000,000)		
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....					
91-50	Total, military personnel.....	190,300,000 (18,100,000)	183,650,000 (16,950,000)	185,550,000 (17,750,000)	—\$4,750,000 (—350,000)	+\$1,900,000 (+800,000)
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
	Operation and maintenance, Navy.....	126,100,000 (26,100,000)	20,000,000 (20,000,000)	20,000,000 (20,000,000)	—6,100,000 (6,100,000)	
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....					
	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps.....	24,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000 (1,000,000)	—1,000,000 (+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
91-50	By transfer*.....					
	Increased pay costs (included above):					
	Budget authority.....	(4,600,000)	(3,600,000)	(3,600,000)	(—1,000,000)	
	By transfer.....				(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
	Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard.....	13,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000 (3,000,000)	—3,000,000 (+3,000,000)	(+3,000,000)
91-50	By transfer.....					
	Increased pay costs (included above):					
	Budget authority.....	(7,600,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(—1,600,000)	

91-50	By transfer.....			(1, 600, 000)	(+1, 600, 000)	
	Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard.....	15, 682, 000	8, 800, 000	8, 800, 000	-6, 882, 000	
	By transfer.....			(5, 377, 000)	(+5, 377, 000)	
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....	(6, 682, 000)	(5, 800, 000)	(5, 800, 000)	(-1, 482, 000)	
	Total, operation and maintenance.....	59, 382, 000	42, 400, 000	42, 400, 000	-16, 982, 000	
	By transfer.....			(9, 577, 000)	(+9, 577, 000)	
	Increased pay costs (included above).					
	Budget authority.....	(44, 982, 000)	(34, 800, 000)	(34, 800, 000)	(-10, 182, 000)	
	By transfer.....			(2, 600, 000)	(+2, 600, 000)	
	Total, chapter II:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	249, 682, 000	228, 050, 000	227, 950, 000	-21, 732, 000	+1, 900, 000
	By transfer.....			(9, 577, 000)	(+9, 577, 000)	
	Increased pay costs (included above).					
	Budget authority.....	(63, 082, 000)	(51, 750, 000)	(52, 550, 000)	(-10, 532, 000)	(+800, 000)
	By transfer.....			(2, 600, 000)	(+2, 600, 000)	
	CHAPTER III					
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
	FEDERAL FUNDS					
91-50	Federal payment to the District of Columbia.....	11, 000, 000	10, 365, 000	10, 365, 000	-635, 000	
91-50	Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay.....	18, 736, 000	Not considered	18, 736, 000		+18, 736, 000
	Total, Federal funds.....	29, 736, 000	10, 365, 000	29, 101, 000	-635, 000	+18, 736, 000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS					
91-50	General operating expenses.....	1, 070, 000	975, 000	975, 000	-95, 000	
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....	(940, 000)	(845, 000)	(845, 000)	(-95, 000)	
91-99	Public safety.....	10, 457, 000	10, 034, 000	10, 034, 000	-423, 000	
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....	(8, 098, 000)	(8, 098, 000)	(8, 098, 000)		

See footnotes at end of table, p. 77.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

56

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER III—Continued					
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Continued					
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS—Continued					
91-50	<i>Education</i>	\$13,931,000	\$13,931,000	\$13,931,000		
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(13,085,000)	(13,085,000)	(13,085,000)		
91-99	<i>Health and welfare</i>	111,000	111,000	111,000		
	<i>Increased pay costs (reallocations) (included above)—budget authority</i>	(111,000)	(111,000)	(111,000)		
91-99	<i>Sanitary engineering</i>	252,000	252,000	252,000		
	<i>Increased pay costs (reclassifications) (included above)—budget authority</i>	(252,000)	(252,000)	(252,000)		
91-99	<i>Settlement of claims and suits</i>	50,000	50,000	50,000		
91-50	<i>Capital outlay</i>	18,736,000	Not considered	18,736,000		+ \$18,736,000
	<i>Total, District of Columbia funds</i>	44,607,000	25,353,000	44,089,000	—\$518,000	+18,736,000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> ³	(22,486,000)	(22,391,000)	(22,391,000)	(—95,000)	
	Total, chapter III, new budget (obligational) authority.....	29,736,000	10,365,000	29,101,000	—635,000	+18,736,000
	CHAPTER IV					
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS					
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE					
91-50	Assistance to refugees in the United States (Cuban refugee program.)	2,853,000	2,700,000		—2,853,000	—2,700,000
	<i>By transfer</i>			4 (2,700,000)	(+2,700,000)	(+2,700,000)
	<i>By transfer—increased pay costs</i>	(38,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(—3,000)	

S. Doc. 91-19	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
	INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS				
	Subscription to the International Development Association.....	160,000,000	-----	160,000,000	-----
	Total, chapter IV:				+160,000,000
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	162,853,000	2,700,000	160,000,000	-2,853,000
	By transfer.....	(38,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(-3,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	By transfer.....	(38,000)	(35,000)	(2,735,000)	(+2,700,000)
CHAPTER V					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS					
91-04	Salaries and expenses, telecommunications.....	777,000	500,000	777,000	+277,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
DISASTER RELIEF					
91-04	Disaster relief.....	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
91-04	Salaries and expenses.....	650,000	600,000	600,000	-50,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(31,000)	(31,000)	(31,000)	
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	
	Release of reserves.....	(31,000)	(31,000)	(31,000)	
	Total.....	(521,000)	(521,000)	(521,000)	
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	⁶ Language		Language	
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	3,139,000	2,573,000	3,139,000	+566,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....	(2,139,000)	(2,139,000)	(2,139,000)	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 77.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER V—Continued INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION					
91-50 and S. Doc. 91-18	Compensation and pensions.....	\$276, 600, 000	\$179, 000, 000	\$276, 600, 000	-----	+\$97, 600, 000
91-50 and S. Doc. 91-18	Readjustment benefits	89, 200, 000	14, 200, 000	89, 200, 000	-----	+75, 000, 000
91-50 and S. Doc. 91-18	Medical care.....	53, 800, 000	46, 189, 000	53, 800, 000	-----	+7, 611, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>	(15, 167, 000)	(15, 167, 000)	(15, 167, 000)	-----	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
	<i>Budget authority</i>	(39, 006, 000)	(31, 595, 000)	(39, 006, 000)	-----	(+7, 611, 000)
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(15, 167, 000)	(15, 167, 000)	(15, 167, 000)	-----	-----
	<i>Total</i>	(54, 173, 000)	(46, 562, 000)	(54, 173, 000)	-----	(+7, 611, 000)

91-50	General operating expenses-----	12,500,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	-\$500,000	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i> -----	(7,900,000)	(7,900,000)	(7,900,000)		-----
	Total, Veterans' Administration-----	432,100,000	251,389,000	431,600,000	-500,000	+180,211,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-864 reserves</i> -----	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)		-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
	<i>Budget authority</i> -----	(46,906,000)	(39,295,000)	(46,906,000)		(+7,611,000)
	<i>Release of reserves</i> -----	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)		-----
	<i>Total</i> -----	(62,073,000)	(54,462,000)	(62,073,000)		(+7,611,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
	MORTGAGE CREDIT					
91-50	<i>Homeownership and rental housing assistance (annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations):</i>					
	<i>Homeownership assistance</i> -----	(50,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(50,000,000)		(+10,000,000)
	<i>Rental housing assistance</i> -----	(50,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(50,000,000)		(+10,000,000)
	RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE					
91-50	<i>College housing (annual contract authorization, increase in limitation)</i> -----	(4,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(-2,000,000)	-----
91-50	Low-rent public housing annual contributions:					
	1968-----	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000		-----
	1969-----	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000		-----
	Total, renewal and housing assistance-----	23,168,000	23,168,000	23,168,000		-----
	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT					
91-50	Payment of participation sales insufficiencies-----	\$4,836,000			-4,836,000	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLE II—Continued**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-50	CHAPTER V—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT— Continued					
	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT—Continued					
	Fair housing program.....	\$2, 000, 000	-----	\$1, 000, 000	-\$1, 000, 000	+\$1, 000, 000
	Total, departmental management.....	6, 836, 000	-----	1, 000, 000	-5, 836, 000	+1, 000, 000
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:					
	1968.....	7, 168, 000	\$7, 168, 000	7, 168, 000	-----	-----
	1969.....	22, 836, 000	16, 000, 000	17, 000, 000	-5, 836, 000	+1, 000, 000
	Total.....	30, 004, 000	23, 168, 000	24, 168, 000	-5, 836, 000	+1, 000, 000
	<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....</i>	<i>(104, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(82, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(102, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(-2, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(+20, 000, 000)</i>
	Total, chapter V:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1968.....	7, 168, 000	7, 168, 000	7, 168, 000	-----	-----
	1969.....	494, 502, 000	306, 062, 000	488, 116, 000	-6, 386, 000	+182, 054, 000
	Total.....	501, 670, 000	313, 230, 000	495, 284, 000	-6, 386, 000	+182, 054, 000
	<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....</i>	<i>(104, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(82, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(102, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(-2, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(+20, 000, 000)</i>
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(15, 248, 000)</i>	<i>(15, 248, 000)</i>	<i>(15, 248, 000)</i>	-----	-----
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
	<i>Budget authority.....</i>	<i>(49, 545, 000)</i>	<i>(41, 854, 000)</i>	<i>(49, 545, 000)</i>	-----	<i>(+7, 611, 000)</i>
	<i>Release of reserves.....</i>	<i>(15, 188, 000)</i>	<i>(15, 188, 000)</i>	<i>(15, 188, 000)</i>	-----	-----
	<i>Total.....</i>	<i>(64, 733, 000)</i>	<i>(57, 122, 000)</i>	<i>(64, 733, 000)</i>	-----	<i>(+7, 611, 000)</i>

CHAPTER VI				
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT				
1-94	Management of land and resources.....	10, 410, 000	10, 410, 000	-----
	By transfer.....	(1, 628, 000)	(1, 628, 000)	-----
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(275, 000)	(275, 000)	-----
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto).....	(175, 000)	(175, 000)	-----
	By transfer.....	(1, 178, 000)	(1, 178, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves.....	(450, 000)	(450, 000)	-----
	Total.....	(1, 628, 000)	(1, 628, 000)	-----
S. Doc. 91-18	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS			
	Education and welfare services.....	2, 781, 000	2, 781, 000	+2, 781, 000
91-94	Resources management.....	2, 769, 000	2, 769, 000	-69, 000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(426, 000)	(426, 000)	-----
	Increased pay costs (included above):			
	Budget authority.....	(1, 619, 000)	(1, 619, 000)	-----
	Release of reserves.....	(426, 000)	(426, 000)	-----
	Total.....	(2, 045, 000)	(2, 045, 000)	-----
91-94	BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION			
	Land and water conservation:			
	Repayable advance to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.....	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	(-19, 000, 000)
	Liquidation of obligations out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.....	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	-----
	OFFICE OF TERRITORIES			
S. Doc. 91-18	Administration of territories.....	950, 000	950, 000	+950, 000
	GEOLOGICAL SURVEY			
1-94 and S. Doc. 91-18	Surveys, investigations, and research.....	2, 242, 000	2, 242, 000	+150, 000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority.....	(1, 792, 000)	(1, 792, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER VI—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
	BUREAU OF MINES					
91-18	Health and safety.....	\$750,000		\$750,000		+\$750,000
91-50	Helium fund (borrowing authorization).....	10,000,000	\$5,000,000	10,000,000		+5,000,000
	OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	123,000	48,000	48,000		
	<i>Increased pay costs (including above)—budget authority.....</i>	<i>(48,000)</i>	<i>(48,000)</i>	<i>(48,000)</i>	-\$75,000	
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES					
91-50	Payment to Fishermen's Protective Fund.....	60,000	60,000	60,000		
	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE					
91-94	Management and investigations of resources.....	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>		
91-94	Construction.....	400,000	200,000	400,000		+200,000
	Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	1,753,000	1,553,000	1,753,000		+200,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>		
	<i>Increased pay costs (including above):</i>					
	<i>Budget authority.....</i>	<i>(1,108,000)</i>	<i>(1,108,000)</i>	<i>(1,108,000)</i>		
	<i>Release of reserves.....</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>	<i>(139,000)</i>		
	<i>Total.....</i>	<i>(1,242,000)</i>	<i>(1,242,000)</i>	<i>(1,242,000)</i>		

91-94	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE				
	Management and protection.....	2,479,000	2,479,000	2,366,000	-113,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(196,000)	(196,000)	(196,000)	
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)	
	Release of reserves.....	(196,000)	(196,000)	(196,000)	
	Total.....	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)	
	Construction.....	1,103,000	100,000	1,103,000	+1,003,000
	Total, National Park Service.....	3,582,000	2,579,000	3,469,000	-113,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(196,000)	(196,000)	(196,000)	
91-50 and S. Doc. 91-18	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)	
	Release of reserves.....	(196,000)	(196,000)	(196,000)	
	Total.....	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)	
	Total, Department of the Interior.....	35,420,000	24,511,000	35,163,000	+10,652,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	
	By transfer.....	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	
	Liquidation cash.....	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(6,241,000)	(6,241,000)	(6,241,000)	
	Release of reserves.....	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	
	By transfer.....	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	
	Total.....	(8,629,000)	(8,629,000)	(8,629,000)	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-94	CHAPTER VI—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
	FOREST SERVICE					
	Forest protection and utilization:					
	Forest land management.....	\$25,028,000	\$25,028,000	\$24,374,000	—\$654,000	—\$654,000
	Forest research.....	1,564,000	1,564,000	1,564,000		
91-50	State and private forestry cooperation.....	124,000	124,000	124,000		
	<i>Release Public Law 90-364, reserves</i>	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)		
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)		
	Total, Department of Agriculture, Forest Service.....	26,716,000	26,716,000	26,082,000	—634,000	—654,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364, reserves</i>	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)		
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)		
91-50	NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
	Salaries and expenses.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000		
	Total, chapter VI:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	65,136,000	54,227,000	64,225,000	—911,000	+9,938,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364, reserves</i>	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)		
	<i>By transfer</i>	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)		
91-50	<i>Liquidation cash</i>	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)		

	Budget authority.....	(18,178,000)	(18,178,000)	(18,178,000)	
	Release of reserves.....	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	
	By transfer.....	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	
	Total.....	(15,561,000)	(15,561,000)	(15,561,000)	
	CHAPTER VII				
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR				
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY				
91-94	Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.....	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	
	MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION				
	Manpower Development and Training Activities.....			7,500,000	+7,500,000
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS				
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION				
91-94	Employees' compensation claims and expenses.....	15,900,000	15,900,000	15,900,000	
	Total, Department of Labor.....	35,900,000	35,900,000	43,400,000	+7,500,000
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
91-50	Higher educational activities.....	11,161,000	11,161,000	19,920,000	+8,759,000
	By transfer.....	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	
	Increase pay costs (included above)—by transfer.....	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
	OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL				
91-50	Comprehensive health planning and services:				
	By transfer.....	6 (\$9,186,000)	6 (\$9,186,000)	6 (\$9,186,000)	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)	
	Increase pay costs (included above)—release of reserves.....	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)	
91-15	District of Columbia Medical Facilities (fiscal year 1970).....	15,000,000	15,000,000		-15,000,000
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE				
91-50	Grants to States for public assistance.....	651,546,000	7 651,546,000	651,546,000	
91-50	Assistance for repatriated United States Nationals.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 77.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
S. Doc. 19-18	CHAPTER VII—Continued DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE Continued SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
	<i>Salaries and expenses (increase in limitation)</i>	(\$16,500,000)		(\$21,400,000)	(+ \$4,700,000)	(+ \$21,400,000)
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	677,807,000	\$677,807,000	671,566,000	-6,241,000	-6,241,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)		
	<i>By limitation increase</i>	(16,500,000)		(21,400,000)	(+4,700,000)	(+ \$21,400,000)
	<i>By transfer</i>	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)		
	<i>Increased pay costs:</i>					
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)		
	<i>By transfer</i>	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)		
	Total.....	(288,000)	(288,000)	(288,000)		
	Total, chapter VII:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	713,707,000	713,707,000	714,966,000	+1,259,000	+1,259,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)		
	<i>By transfer</i>	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)		
	By limitation increase.....	(16,500,000)		(21,400,000)	(+4,700,000)	(+ \$21,400,000)
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)		
	<i>By transfer</i>	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)		
	Total.....	(288,000)	(288,000)	(288,000)		

CHAPTER VIII					
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
SENATE					
91-94	Gratuity to widow of deceased Senator.....			30,000	+30,000
	SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES			(Language)	
	Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators.....				
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE				
	Inquiries and investigations, 1968.....	126,900		126,900	+126,900
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES				
	Gratuity to mother of a deceased Member.....		30,000	30,000	+30,000
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES			(Language)	
	Miscellaneous items.....				
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			(Language)	
	House office buildings.....				
	Total, chapter VIII—New budget (obligational) authority:				
	1968.....	126,900		126,900	+126,900
	1969.....		30,000	60,000	+30,000
CHAPTER IX					
PUBLIC WORKS					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL					
91-18	Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	25,000,000		25,000,000	+25,000,000
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION					
91-21	Plant and capital equipment.....	45,000,000		45,000,000	+45,000,000
	Total, ch. IX—New budget (obligational) authority.....	70,000,000		70,000,000	+70,000,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House bill	
91-98	CHAPTER X						
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE						
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION						
	Salaries and expenses, general administration.....	\$127,000	\$65,000	\$65,000	—\$62,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364, reserves (and transfer hereto)</i>	(233,000)	(233,000)	(233,000)			
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>						
91-98	<i>Budget authority.....</i>	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)			
	<i>Release of reserves.....</i>	(233,000)	(233,000)	(233,000)			
	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	1,667,000	1,314,000	1,277,000	—390,000	—\$37,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364, reserves (and transfer hereto)</i>	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)			
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364, reserves.....</i>	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)			
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>						
91-98	<i>Budget authority.....</i>	(878,000)	(878,000)	(878,000)			
	<i>Release of reserves.....</i>	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)			
	Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	99,000	99,000	99,000			
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364, reserves (and transfer hereto)</i>	(262,000)	(262,000)	(262,000)			
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364, reserves.....</i>	(90,000)	(90,000)	(90,000)			

91-98	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>						
	Budget authority.....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)			
	Release of reserves.....	(352,000)	(352,000)	(352,000)			
	Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals.....	2,833,000	2,805,000	2,805,000		-328,000	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)			
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>						
	Budget authority.....	(1,468,000)	(1,468,000)	(1,468,000)			
	Release of reserves.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)			
	Total, legal activities and general administration.....	4,726,000	3,983,000	3,946,000		-780,000	-37,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(935,000)	(935,000)	(935,000)			
91-50	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>						
	Budget authority.....	(2,376,000)	(2,376,000)	(2,376,000)			
	Release of reserves.....	(935,000)	(935,000)	(935,000)			
	Total.....	(3,311,000)	(3,311,000)	(3,311,000)			
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM						
	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons.....	2,319,000	2,319,000	2,319,000			
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)			
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>						
	Budget authority.....	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)			
	Release of reserves.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)			
91-98	Support of U.S. prisoners.....	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000			
	Total, Federal Prison System.....	4,819,000	4,819,000	4,819,000			
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)			
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>						
	Budget authority.....	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)			
	Release of reserves.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)			
	Total.....	(2,092,000)	(2,092,000)	(2,092,000)			

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-94	CHAPTER X—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued					
	BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS					
	Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,422,000	\$1,187,000	\$1,187,000	—\$235,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)		
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
	<i>Budget authority</i>	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)		
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)		
	<i>Total</i>	(850,000)	(850,000)	(850,000)		
	Total, Department of Justice.....	10,987,000	9,989,000	9,952,000	—1,015,000	—\$37,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(1,586,000)	(1,586,000)	(1,586,000)		
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
91-94	<i>Budget authority</i>	(4,668,000)	(4,668,000)	(4,668,000)		
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(1,586,000)	(1,586,000)	(1,586,000)		
	<i>Total</i>	(6,253,000)	(6,253,000)	(6,253,000)		
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE					
	Operations and administration (<i>release of Public Law 904 reserves</i>).....	\$ (116,000)	\$ (116,000)	\$ (116,000)		
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—release of reserves</i>	(116,000)	(116,000)	(116,000)		

See footnotes at end of table, p. 77.

S. Doc. 91-18	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION <i>Salaries and expenses (language limitation)</i>	(147,000)			(147,000)		(+147,000)
91-50	MARITIME ADMINISTRATION <i>State marine schools (liquidation of obligations—by transfer)</i>	(210,000)			(210,000)		
	THE JUDICIARY						
	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES						
91-94	Printing and binding Supreme Court reports: 1969	27,000		27,000		27,000	
	1968	10,000		10,000		10,000	
	Total, Supreme Court of the United States	37,000		37,000		37,000	
91-94	CUSTOMS COURT Salaries and expenses	155,850		113,000		113,000	-42,850
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(92,900)		(92,900)		(92,900)	
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES						
91-94	Salaries of judges	2,075,000		1,975,000		1,948,000	-27,000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(1,830,000)		(1,830,000)		(1,830,000)	
91-50	Salaries of supporting personnel	2,865,000		2,412,000		2,412,000	
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(2,165,000)		(2,165,000)		(2,165,000)	
S. Doc. 91-18	Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel:						
	Fiscal year 1968	850,000				850,000	+850,000
	Fiscal year 1969	850,000				850,000	+850,000
91-50	Travel and miscellaneous expenses	525,000		400,000		400,000	-125,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-94	CHAPTER X—Continued					
	THE JUDICIARY—Continued					
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES—Continued					
	Administrative Office of the United States Courts.....	\$141,500	\$97,500	\$97,500	—\$44,000	
	By transfer.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		
	Increased pay costs (included above):					
	Budget authority.....	(87,500)	(87,500)	(87,500)		
	By transfer.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		
	Total.....	(97,500)	(97,500)	(97,500)		
	Total, court of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:					
	Fiscal year 1968.....	850,000		850,000		+\$850,000
	Fiscal year 1969.....	6,456,500	4,884,500	5,707,500	—749,000	+823,000
	By transfer.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		
	Increased pay costs (included above):					
	Budget authority.....	(4,082,500)	(4,082,500)	(4,082,500)		
	By transfer.....	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		
	Total.....	(4,092,500)	(4,092,500)	(4,092,500)		

Total, the Judiciary:					
Fiscal year 1968.....	860,000	10,000	860,000	-----	+850,000
Fiscal year 1969.....	6,639,350	5,024,500	5,847,500	-----	+823,000
Total.....	7,499,350	5,034,500	6,707,500	-----	+1,673,000
<i>By transfer</i>	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	-----	-----
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority.....	(4,175,400)	(4,175,400)	(4,175,400)	-----	-----
<i>By transfer</i>	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	-----	-----
Total.....	(4,185,400)	(4,185,400)	(4,185,400)	-----	-----
Total, chapter X:					
New budget (obligational) authority:					
1969.....	17,606,350	15,013,500	15,799,500	-----	+786,000
1968.....	860,000	10,000	860,000	-----	+850,000
Total.....	18,466,350	15,023,500	16,659,500	-----	+1,636,000
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	-----	-----
Limitation increase.....	(147,000)	-----	(147,000)	-----	(+147,000)
<i>By transfer</i>	(220,000)	(220,000)	(220,000)	-----	-----
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority.....	(8,843,400)	(8,843,400)	(8,843,400)	-----	-----
Release.....	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	-----	-----
<i>By transfer</i>	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	-----	-----
Total.....	(10,554,400)	(10,554,400)	(10,554,400)	-----	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
S. Doc. 91-18	CHAPTER XI					
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
	Salaries and expenses.....	\$4,634,000	-----	\$2,000,000	-\$2,634,000	+\$2,000,000
91-94	NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD					
	Salaries and expenses.....	298,000	\$298,000	298,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)		
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
	<i>Budget authority</i>	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)		
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)		
91-50	<i>Total</i>	(178,000)	(178,000)	(178,000)		
	COAST GUARD					
	Retired pay.....	2,300,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-300,000	
	Total, chapter XI:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	7,232,000	2,298,000	4,298,000	-2,934,000	+2,000,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)		
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>					
	<i>Budget authority</i>	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)		

	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(28, 000)	(28, 000)	(28, 000)	
	<i>Total</i>	(178, 000)	(178, 000)	(178, 000)	
	CHAPTER XII				
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT				
91-50	Administering the public debt.....	1, 978, 000	1, 978, 000	1, 978, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(854, 000)	(854, 000)	(854, 000)	
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>				
	<i>Budget authority</i>	(643, 000)	(643, 000)	(643, 000)	
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(854, 000)	(854, 000)	(854, 000)	
	<i>Total</i>	(877, 000)	(877, 000)	(877, 000)	
S. Doc. 91-18	SECRET SERVICE				
	Salaries and expenses.....	470, 000		470, 000	+470, 000
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
	COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS				
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	107, 000	107, 000	100, 000	-7, 000
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority</i>	(42, 000)	(42, 000)	(42, 000)	
	NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL				
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	200, 000	200, 000	147, 000	-53, 000
	Total, Executive Office of the President.....	307, 000	307, 000	247, 000	-60, 000
	Total, chapter XII:				
	New budget obligational authority.....	2, 755, 000	2, 285, 000	2, 695, 000	+410, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(854, 000)	(854, 000)	(854, 000)	
	<i>Increased pay costs (included above):</i>				
	<i>Budget authority</i>	(585, 000)	(585, 000)	(585, 000)	
	<i>Release of reserves</i>	(854, 000)	(854, 000)	(854, 000)	
	<i>Total</i>	(919, 000)	(919, 000)	(919, 000)	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-101 and S. Doc. 91-18 and S. Doc. 91-22	CHAPTER XIII CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS					
	Claims and judgments.....	\$18, 188, 688	\$16, 880, 812	\$18, 188, 688	-----	+\$1, 307, 876
	Total, title II:					
	New budget authority:					
	Fiscal year 1968.....	8, 154, 900	7, 178, 000	8, 154, 900	-----	+976, 900
	Fiscal year 1969.....	1, 844, 516, 038	1, 358, 736, 312	1, 808, 517, 188	-\$35, 998, 850	+449, 780, 876
	Total.....	1, 852, 670, 938	1, 365, 914, 312	1, 816, 672, 088	-35, 998, 850	450, 757, 776
	<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations</i>	(104, 500, 000)	(82, 500, 000)	(102, 500, 000)	(-2, 000, 000)	(+20, 000, 000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(20, 489, 000)	(20, 489, 000)	(20, 489, 000)	-----	-----
	<i>Limitation increases</i>	(16, 647, 000)		(21, 347, 000)	(+4, 700, 000)	(+21, 347, 000)
	<i>By transfer</i>	(11, 232, 000)	(11, 232, 000)	(23, 306, 000)	(+12, 074, 000)	(+12, 077, 000)
	<i>Liquidation cash</i>	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	(19, 000, 000)	-----	-----

Increased pay costs (included above):

Budget authority	(185,378,400)	(116,435,400)	(124,846,400)	(-10,532,000)	(+8,411,000)
Release of reserves	(18,589,000)	(18,589,000)	(18,589,000)	-----	-----
By transfer	(1,386,000)	(1,383,000)	(3,983,000)	(+2,597,000)	(+2,600,000)
Total	(155,353,400)	(136,407,400)	(147,418,400)	(-7,935,000)	(+11,011,000)

¹ Also proposes that \$17,000,000 now earmarked for maintenance of real property be utilized for the general purposes of this appropriation.

² Also proposes that \$1,500,000 now earmarked for maintenance of real property be utilized for the general purposes of this appropriation.

³ Includes reallocations under Department of Public Health (\$111,000), and reclassifications under Department of Sanitary Engineering (\$252,000).

⁴ To be derived by transfer from "Economic assistance" appropriations of the Agency or International Development.

⁵ To permit purchase of 1 replacement aircraft from available funds at an estimated cost of \$300,000.

⁶ And an additional \$250,000 proposed to be made available through congressional action to reduce funds earmarked for planning grants.

⁷ Combined under the heading "Grants to States for public assistance" in the bill.

⁸ Also language reducing by \$800,000 the amount to be advanced from this appropriation to the Small Business Administration for loan processing services.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
	SENATE					
91-94	Compensation of the Vice President and Senators.....	\$458, 270		\$458, 270		+\$458, 270
91-94	Salaries, officers and employees.....	2, 147, 837		1, 647, 837	-\$500, 000	+1, 647, 837
91-94	Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate.....					
91-94	Contingent expenses of the Senate.	21, 905		21, 905		+21, 905
91-94	Senate policy committees.....	27, 190		27, 190		+27, 190
91-50	Automobiles and maintenance.....	2, 180		2, 180		+2, 180
91-94	Inquiries and investigations.....	370, 640		370, 640		+370, 640
91-50	Folding documents.....	2, 565		2, 565		+2, 565
91-50	Miscellaneous items.....	186, 515		169, 015	-17, 500	+169, 015
	Total, Senate.....	3, 217, 102		2, 699, 602	-517, 500	+2, 699, 602
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
91-94	Compensation of Members.....	1, 975, 000	\$1, 975, 000	1, 975, 000		
91-50, 94	Salaries, officers and employees.....	1, 115, 155	940, 590	940, 590	-174, 565	
91-94	Members' clerk hire.....	3, 090, 000	3, 050, 000	3, 050, 000	-40, 000	

91-50, 94	Contingent expenses of the House.....	132,485	132,485	132,485	
	Total, House of Representatives.....	6,312,640	6,098,075	6,098,075	-214,565
	JOINT ITEMS				
91-50	Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.....	3,100			-3,100
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE				
91-94	Joint Economic Committee.....	22,025	13,500	13,500	-8,525
91-94	Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.....	17,820	17,820	17,820	
91-94	Joint Committee on Printing.....	12,425	12,425	12,425	
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE				
91-94	Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.....	27,250			-27,250
91-50	Joint Committee on Defense Production.....	7,950	7,950	7,950	
	Total, joint items.....	90,570	51,695	51,695	-38,875
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
	OFFICE OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL				
91-50	Salaries.....	36,000	36,000	36,000	
	CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS				
91-50	Capitol buildings.....	74,500	74,500	74,500	
91-50	Capitol Grounds.....	25,600	25,600	25,600	
91-50	Senate office buildings.....	174,000		174,000	+174,000
91-50	Senate garage.....	6,500		6,500	+6,500
91-50	House office buildings.....	320,000	300,000	300,000	-20,000
91-50	Capitol Power Plant.....	27,500	27,500	27,500	
	LIBRARY BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS				
91-50	Structural and mechanical care.....	28,000	28,000	28,000	
	Total, Architect of the Capitol.....	692,100	491,600	672,100	-20,000
					+180,500

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with— Budget estimate House bill
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued				
	BOTANIC GARDEN				
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$22,500	
	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS				
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	766,000	579,300	579,300	-\$186,700
91-50	Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses.....	122,000	109,800	109,800	-12,200
91-94	Legislative Reference Service: Salaries and expenses.....	220,000	170,000	170,000	-50,000
	<i>By transfer.....</i>		(50,000)	(50,000)	(+50,000)
91-50	Distribution of catalog cards: Salaries and expenses.....	150,000			-150,000
91-50	Books for the blind and physically handicapped: Salaries and expenses.....	23,000			-23,000
91-50	Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents: Salaries and expenses.....	6,000	6,000	6,000	
91-50	Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program).....	11,000	9,000	9,000	-2,000
	Total, Library of Congress.....	1,298,000	874,100	874,100	-423,900
	GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE				
91-50	Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses.....	228,000	178,000	178,000	-50,000
	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE				
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	2,714,000	2,214,000	2,114,000	-600,000
	Total, legislative branch:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	14,574,912	9,929,970	12,710,072	-1,864,840
	<i>By transfer.....</i>		(50,000)	(50,000)	(+50,000)
					-2,780,102
					-\$100,000

THE JUDICIARY				
91-94	SALARIES	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES	120,000	120,000
91-50	Care of the buildings and grounds.....		15,900	15,900
	Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....		135,900	135,900
91-50	SALARIES AND EXPENSES	COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS	16,000	16,000
91-94	SALARIES AND EXPENSES	COURT OF CLAIMS	64,000	64,000
91-50	EXPENSES OF REFEREES	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES	248,000	248,000
91-94	SALARIES OF REFEREES		404,000	404,000
	Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services.....		652,000	652,000
	Total, the Judiciary: New budget (obligational) authority.....		867,900	867,900
91-50	COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT	44,584	44,584
91-18	SALARIES AND EXPENSES	BUREAU OF THE BUDGET	50,000	50,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>		(355,000)	(355,000)
91-50	SALARIES AND EXPENSES	OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS	100,000	100,000
91-50	<i>Release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>		(70,000)	(70,000)
91-50	SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS (<i>release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>).....		(40,000)	(40,000)
91-50	CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES		30,000	30,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>		(40,000)	(40,000)
	Total, Office of Emergency Preparedness.....		130,000	130,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>		(150,000)	(150,000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—Continued					
	OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(\$28,000)	(\$28,000)	(\$28,000)		
	SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS					
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	32,000	32,000	32,000		
	Total, Executive Office of the President:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	256,584	256,584	256,584		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(533,000)	(533,000)	(533,000)		
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
	ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
91-50	Administrative expenses, Agency for International Development (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(2,137,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(-\$637,000)	
91-50	Administrative and other expenses, Department of State (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(95,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(-20,000)	
	Total, funds appropriated to the President, economic assistance (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(2,232,000)	(1,575,000)	(1,575,000)	(-\$657,000)	
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE					
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(6,615,000)	(6,615,000)	(6,615,000)		

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-04	Payments and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(81, 000)	(81, 000)
FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE			
91-50	Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(135, 000)	(135, 000)
FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	73, 000	73, 000
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE			
91-50	Conservation operations.....	3, 980, 000	3, 980, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(1, 000, 000)	(1, 000, 000)
91-50	Watershed planning.....	254, 000	254, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(90, 000)	(90, 000)
91-50	River basin surveys and investigations.....	306, 000	306, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(90, 000)	(90, 000)
91-50	Watershed works of improvement.....	688, 000	688, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(300, 000)	(300, 000)
91-50	Flood prevention.....	224, 000	224, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(128, 000)	(128, 000)
91-50	Great Plains conservation program.....	160, 000	160, 000
91-50	Resource conservation and development.....	111, 000	111, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(100, 000)	(100, 000)
	Total, Soil Conservation Service.....	5, 723, 000	5, 723, 000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(1, 708, 000)	(1, 708, 000)
ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	684, 000	684, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Budget estimate	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—
						House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued					
	STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	\$527,000	\$527,000	\$527,000		
	CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE					
91-85	Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs	2,897,000	2,300,000	2,000,000	—\$897,000	—\$300,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	(400,000)	(600,000)	(600,000)	(+400,000)	
91-50	Special milk program (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)		
	FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE					
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(362,000)	(362,000)	(362,000)		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	(68,000)	(68,000)	(68,000)		
	COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	65,000	65,000	65,000		
	AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE					
91-50	Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (<i>by transfer</i>)	(4,508,000)	(4,108,000)	(4,108,000)	(—400,000)	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	(351,000)	(551,000)	(551,000)	(+200,000)	
	RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	18,000	18,000	18,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)		

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL				
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	568,000	568,000	568,000
PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION				
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	49,000	49,000	49,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves-----</i>	<i>(64,000)</i>	<i>(64,000)</i>	<i>(64,000)</i>
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL				
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	239,000	239,000	239,000
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	58,000	58,000	58,000
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY				
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	40,000	40,000	40,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves-----</i>	<i>(35,000)</i>	<i>(35,000)</i>	<i>(35,000)</i>
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES				
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	116,000	116,000	116,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves-----</i>	<i>(9,000)</i>	<i>(9,000)</i>	<i>(9,000)</i>
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	188,000	188,000	188,000
	<i>By transfer-----</i>	<i>(36,000)</i>	<i>(36,000)</i>	<i>(36,000)</i>
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves-----</i>	<i>(30,000)</i>	<i>(30,000)</i>	<i>(30,000)</i>
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION				
91-50	Salaries and expenses-----	624,000	624,000	624,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves-----</i>	<i>(11,000)</i>	<i>(11,000)</i>	<i>(11,000)</i>
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION				
91-94	Salaries and expenses-----	1,359,000	1,359,000	1,359,000
	<i>By transfer-----</i>	<i>(276,000)</i>	<i>(276,000)</i>	<i>(276,000)</i>
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)-----</i>	<i>(215,000)</i>	<i>(215,000)</i>	<i>(215,000)</i>
				-450,000
				(+400,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-50	FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION					
	Administrative and operating expenses.....	\$274, 000	\$274, 000	\$274, 000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364</i>	(97, 000)	(97, 000)	(97, 000)		
	Total, Department of Agriculture:					
	New budget (obligational authority).....	13, 952, 000	12, 905, 000	12, 605, 000	—\$1, 347, 000	—\$300, 000
91-94	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
	Salaries and expenses.....	218, 000	218, 000	218, 000		
	<i>By transfer</i>	(75, 000)	(75, 000)	(75, 000)		
	Salaries and expenses (by transfer).....	(75, 000)	(75, 000)	(75, 000)		
91-50	OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS					
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(59, 000)	(59, 000)	(59, 000)		
	Salaries and expenses.....	567, 000	567, 000	567, 000		
	1967 economic censuses.....	285, 000	285, 000	285, 000		
	Total, Bureau of the Census.....	852, 000	852, 000	852, 000		

BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	206, 000	206, 000	206, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(36, 000)</i>	<i>(36, 000)</i>	<i>(36, 000)</i>	
INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	200, 000	200, 000	200, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(163, 000)</i>	<i>(163, 000)</i>	<i>(163, 000)</i>	
91-50	Export control.....	136, 000	136, 000	136, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(60, 000)</i>	<i>(60, 000)</i>	<i>(60, 000)</i>	
	Total, International activities.....	336, 000	336, 000	336, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(223, 000)</i>	<i>(223, 000)</i>	<i>(223, 000)</i>	
OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	142, 000	142, 000	142, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(77, 000)</i>	<i>(77, 000)</i>	<i>(77, 000)</i>	
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
91-04	Salaries and expenses.....	3, 254, 000	3, 254, 000	3, 254, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(786, 000)</i>	<i>(786, 000)</i>	<i>(786, 000)</i>	
91-50	Research and development.....	614, 000	614, 000	614, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(117, 000)</i>	<i>(117, 000)</i>	<i>(117, 000)</i>	
	Total, Environmental Science Services Administration.....	3, 868, 000	3, 868, 000	3, 868, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(903, 000)</i>	<i>(903, 000)</i>	<i>(903, 000)</i>	
PATENT OFFICE					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 240, 000	1, 240, 000	1, 240, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(321, 000)</i>	<i>(321, 000)</i>	<i>(321, 000)</i>	
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS					
91-50	Research and technical services.....	1, 100, 000	1, 100, 000	1, 100, 000	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued					
	MARITIME ADMINISTRATION					
91-50	Salaries and expenses, for administrative expenses.....	\$261,000	\$261,000	\$261,000		
91-94	Maritime training.....	100,000	100,000	100,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(99,000)</i>	<i>(99,000)</i>	<i>(99,000)</i>		
	Total, Maritime Administration.....	361,000	361,000	361,000		
	FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	173,000	173,000	173,000		
	Total, Department of Commerce:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	8,496,000	8,496,000	8,496,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(1,718,000)</i>	<i>(1,718,000)</i>	<i>(1,718,000)</i>		
	<i>By transfer.....</i>	<i>(150,000)</i>	<i>(150,000)</i>	<i>(150,000)</i>		
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY					
	MILITARY PERSONNEL					
91-50	Military personnel, Army.....	331,000,000	230,000,000	300,000,000	—\$31,000,000	+\$70,000,000
91-50	Military personnel, Navy.....	198,700,000	160,000,000	198,700,000		+38,700,000
91-94	Military personnel, Marine Corps.....	61,500,000	45,000,000	61,500,000		+16,500,000
91-50	Military personnel, Air Force.....	267,600,000	214,000,000	267,600,000		+53,600,000
91-50	Reserve personnel, Army.....	5,600,000			—5,600,000	

91-50	Reserve personnel, Air Force.....	1, 900, 000			-1, 900, 000	
91-50	National Guard personnel, Army.....	16, 400, 000	13, 000, 000	16, 400, 000		+3, 400, 000
91-50	National Guard personnel, Air Force.....	3, 400, 000			-3, 400, 000	
	Total, military personnel.....	886, 100, 000	662, 000, 000	844, 200, 000	-41, 900, 000	+182, 200, 000
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Army.....	106, 800, 000	85, 000, 000	85, 000, 000	-21, 800, 000	
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	91, 200, 000	73, 000, 000	73, 000, 000	-18, 200, 000	
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies.....	40, 500, 000	32, 000, 000	32, 000, 000	-8, 500, 000	
	By transfer.....			(3, 600, 000)	(+3, 600, 000)	
91-50	Court of Military Appeals.....	18, 000	18, 000	18, 000		
	Total, operation and maintenance.....	238, 518, 000	190, 018, 000	190, 018, 000	-48, 500, 000	
	By transfer.....			(3, 600, 000)	(+3, 600, 000)	
	Total, Department of Defense—Military; New budget (obligational) authority.....	1, 124, 618, 000	852, 018, 000	1, 034, 218, 000	-90, 400, 000	+182, 200, 000
	By transfer.....			(3, 600, 000)	(+3, 600, 000)	
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
	CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL					
91-50	Operation and maintenance, general.....	1, 731, 000	1, 731, 000	1, 731, 000		
91-50	Release Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto) General expenses (release of Public Law 90-364 reserves and transfer hereto).....	(1, 869, 000) (1, 191, 000)	(1, 869, 000) (1, 000, 000)	(1, 869, 000) (1, 100, 000)	(-31, 000)	(+100, 000)
	Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil..... Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	1, 731, 000 (3, 000, 000)	1, 731, 000 (2, 869, 000)	1, 731, 000 (2, 969, 000)	(-31, 000)	(+100, 000)
	UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME					
91-50	Operation and maintenance (release of Public Law 90-364 reserves).....	(181, 000)	(181, 000)	(181, 000)		
	Total, Department of the Army.....	1, 731, 000	1, 731, 000	1, 731, 000		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(3, 181, 000)	(3, 060, 000)	(3, 150, 000)	(-31, 000)	(+100, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
915-50	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL—Continued					
	THE PANAMA CANAL					
	CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT					
	Operating expenses.....	\$1,085,000	\$1,085,000	\$1,085,000		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)		
91-85	PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND					
	Limitation on general and administrative expenses.....	(180,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (limitation on expenses).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)		
	Total, The Panama Canal.....	1,085,000	1,085,000	1,085,000		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)		
	Limitation on general and administrative expenses.....	(180,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (limitation on expenses).....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)		
	Total, Department of Defense—Civil:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,816,000	2,816,000	2,816,000		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(3,321,000)	(3,190,000)	(3,290,000)	(—\$31,000)	(+\$100,000)
91-50	Limitation on general and administrative expenses.....	(180,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)		
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
	FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION					
	Salaries and expenses (by transfer).....	(1,589,000)	(1,589,000)	(1,589,000)		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(836,000)	(836,000)	(836,000)		

OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
91-50	School assistance in federally affected areas (<i>by transfer</i>)	(16,000)	(16,000)	(16,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(694,000)	(694,000)	(694,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(1,123,000)	(1,123,000)	(1,123,000)
91-50	Civil rights educational activities (<i>by transfer</i>)	(67,000)	(67,000)	(67,000)
	Total, Office of Education:			
	<i>By transfer</i>	(777,000)	(777,000)	(777,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(1,135,000)	(1,135,000)	(1,135,000)
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL				
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(307,000)	(307,000)	(307,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(80,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)
HEALTH MANPOWER				
91-85	Health manpower education and utilization (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(201,000)	(201,000)	(201,000)
91-85	Dental health activities (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(102,000)	(102,000)	(102,000)
	Total, health manpower (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(303,000)	(303,000)	(303,000)
DISEASE PREVENTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL				
91-50	Chronic diseases (<i>by transfer</i>)	(436,000)	(436,000)	(436,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(180,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)
91-50 and 91-85	Air pollution (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(519,000)	(519,000)	(519,000)
91-50	Urban and industrial health (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(492,000)	(492,000)	(492,000)
91-50	Radiological health (<i>by transfer</i>)	(407,000)	(407,000)	(407,000)
	Total, disease prevention and environmental control:			
	<i>By transfer</i>	(843,000)	(843,000)	(843,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(1,141,000)	(1,141,000)	(1,141,000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE— Continued					
	PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—Continued					
	HEALTH SERVICES					
91-85	Community health services (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(\$590,000)	(\$590,000)	(\$590,000)		
91-85	Patient care and special health services (<i>by transfer</i>)	(\$2,193,000)	(\$2,193,000)	(1,993,000)	(-\$200,000)	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(91,000)	(91,000)	(91,000)		
91-85	Hospital construction activities (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(169,000)	(169,000)	(169,000)		
91-50	Indian health activities (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves and transfer thereto</i>)					(-\$2,640,000)
	<i>By transfer</i>	(\$2,640,000)				(+\$2,640,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(\$14,000)	(\$14,000)	(\$14,000)		
	Total, health services:					
	<i>By transfer</i>	(4,833,000)	(1,993,000)	(4,833,000)	(-\$200,000)	(+\$2,640,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(1,064,000)	(\$3,704,000)	(1,064,000)		(-\$2,640,000)
	NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH					
91-50	Biologics standards (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(114,000)	(114,000)	(114,000)		
91-50	Regional medical programs (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(67,000)	(67,000)	(67,000)		
91-50	Environmental health sciences (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(137,000)	(137,000)	(137,000)		
	Total, National Institutes of Health (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(\$318,000)	(\$318,000)	(\$318,000)		

91-50	NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH				
	Mental health research and services (<i>by transfer</i>)	(401,000)	(401,000)	(401,000)	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(801,000)	(801,000)	(801,000)	
91-50	St. Elizabeths Hospital, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(1,984,000)	(1,984,000)	(1,984,000)	
	Total, National Institute of Mental Health:				
	By transfer	(2,385,000)	(2,385,000)	(2,385,000)	
91-50	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(801,000)	(801,000)	(801,000)	
	OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE				
	National health statistics (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(271,000)	(271,000)	(271,000)	
91-50	National Library of Medicine (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(162,000)	(162,000)	(162,000)	
	Total, other Public Health Service (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(433,000)	(433,000)	(433,000)	
	Total, Public Health Service:				
91-50	By transfer	(5,728,000)	(5,528,000)	(8,168,000)	(+2,640,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(6,780,000)	(6,780,000)	(4,140,000)	(-2,640,000)
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE				
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(1,234,000)	(1,234,000)	(1,234,000)	
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION				
	Limitation on salaries and expenses (<i>trust fund</i>)	(18,147,000)	(18,147,000)	(18,147,000)	
91-50	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS				
	Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(56,000)	(56,000)	(56,000)	
	Howard University, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(401,000)	(401,000)	(401,000)	
91-50	Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(291,000)	(291,000)	(291,000)	
	Total, special institutions (<i>by transfer</i>)	(748,000)	(748,000)	(748,000)	
91-50	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(216,000)	(216,000)	(216,000)	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(232,000)	(232,000)	(232,000)	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE— Continued					
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY—Continued					
91-50	Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(\$215,000)	(\$215,000)	(\$215,000)		
91-50	Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)	(458,000)	(458,000)	(458,000)		
91-50	Office of Administration, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(233,000)	(233,000)	(233,000)		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)		
91-50	Surplus property utilization (<i>by transfer</i>)	(57,000)	(57,000)	(57,000)		
91-50	Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(56,000)	(56,000)	(56,000)		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(61,000)	(61,000)	(61,000)		
	Total, Office of the Secretary:					
	<i>By transfer</i>	(777,000)	(777,000)	(777,000)		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(761,000)	(761,000)	(761,000)		
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:					
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(8,871,000)	(9,511,000)	(6,871,000)		(- \$2,640,000)
	<i>By transfer</i>	(13,493,000)	(10,653,000)	(13,293,000)	(-200,000)	(+2,640,000)
	<i>Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)</i>	(18,147,000)	(18,147,000)	(18,147,000)		

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 407, 000 (387, 000)	1, 407, 000 (387, 000)	1, 407, 000 (387, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>				-----
	METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT				-----
91-85	Salaries and expenses.....	280, 000 (73, 000)	280, 000 (73, 000)	280, 000 (73, 000)	-----
91-50	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>				-----
	DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS				-----
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	66, 000 (34, 000) (137, 000) (15, 000) (8, 000) 66, 000 (55, 000) (137, 000)	66, 000 (34, 000) (137, 000) (15, 000) (8, 000) 66, 000 (55, 000) (137, 000)	66, 000 (34, 000) (137, 000) (15, 000) (8, 000) 66, 000 (55, 000) (137, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>				-----
91-50	Urban research and technology (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>)				-----
	Total, Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations.....				-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>				-----
	<i>By transfer</i>				-----
	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT				-----
91-50	General administration.....	230, 000 (51, 000) 278, 000 (80, 000) 508, 000 (131, 000)	230, 000 (51, 000) 278, 000 (80, 000) 508, 000 (131, 000)	230, 000 (51, 000) 278, 000 (80, 000) 508, 000 (131, 000)	-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>				-----
91-50	Regional management and services.....				-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>				-----
	Total, Departmental management.....				-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>				-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT— Continued					
	MORTGAGE CREDIT					
91-85	Federal Housing Administration:					
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(\$465,000)	(\$465,000)	(\$465,000)		
	<i>Limitation on nonadministrative expenses</i>	(2,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-\$1,000,000)	
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,261,000	2,261,000	2,261,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(646,000)	(646,000)	(646,000)		
	<i>By transfer</i>	(157,000)	(157,000)	(157,000)		
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(465,000)	(465,000)	(465,000)		
	<i>Limitation on nonadministrative expenses</i>	(2,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(-1,000,000)	
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
91-50	Education and welfare services.....	2,843,000	2,843,000	2,843,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(415,000)	(415,000)	(415,000)		
91-50	Construction (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(39,000)	(39,000)	(39,000)		
91-50	Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(38,000)	(38,000)	(38,000)		
91-50	General administrative expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(246,000)	(246,000)	(246,000)		

91-50	Operation and maintenance, Indian irrigation systems (<i>release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>).....	(117, 000)	(117, 000)		
91-50	Power systems, Indian irrigation projects (<i>release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>).....	(39, 000)	(39, 000)		
91-50	Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, schools, etc. (<i>release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>).....	(40, 000)	(40, 000)		
91-50	Tribal funds (<i>release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>).....	(48, 000)	(48, 000)		
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	2, 843, 000	2, 843, 000		
	Release of Public Law 90-564 reserves.....	(736, 000)	(736, 000)		
	By transfer.....	(246, 000)	(246, 000)		
	BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION				
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	175, 000	175, 000		
	BUREAU OF MINES				
91-50	Conservation and development of mineral resources.....		750, 000	+750, 000	
	(By transfer).....	(1, 183, 000)	(423, 000)	(-760, 000)	
91-50	Health and safety (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(347, 000)	(347, 000)		
91-50	General administrative expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(70, 000)	(70, 000)		
	Total, Bureau of Mines.....		750, 000	+750, 000	
	(By transfer).....	(1, 600, 000)	(850, 000)	(-750, 000)	
	BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES				
91-94	Management and investigations of resources.....	623, 000	623, 000		
	Release of Public Law 90-564 reserves.....	(59, 000)	(59, 000)		
91-50	Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development.....	8, 000	8, 000		
91-50	Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation.....	7, 000	7, 000		
91-50	General administrative expenses.....	45, 000	45, 000		
91-50	Administration of Pribilof Islands.....	20, 000	20, 000		
91-50	Promote and develop fishery products and research pertaining to American fisheries (<i>release of Public Law 90-564 reserves</i>).....	(10, 000)	(10, 000)		

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-50	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES—Continued Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund (<i>increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>).....	(\$13,000)	(\$13,000)	(\$13,000)		
		708,000	708,000	708,000		
		(69,000)	(69,000)	(69,000)		
		(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)		
	Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....					
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....					
	Limitation on administrative expenses.....					
91-94	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves and transfer hereto</i>).....	(9,000)	(9,000)	(9,000)		
		78,000	78,000	78,000		
		(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)		
		78,000	78,000	78,000		
91-94	General administrative expenses.....	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)		
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (<i>and transfer hereto</i>).....					
	Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....					
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....					
91-94	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	668,000	668,000	668,000		
		(116,000)	(116,000)	(116,000)		
		186,000	186,000	186,000		
		21,000	21,000	21,000		
91-50	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....					
91-50	General administrative expenses.....					
91-50	Preservation of historic properties.....					

	Total, National Park Service.....	875,000 (115,000)	875,000 (115,000)	875,000 (115,000)	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>				
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
91-50	General investigations.....	371,000	371,000	371,000	
91-50	Operation and maintenance.....	787,000	630,000	630,000	-\$157,000
91-50	General administrative expenses.....	503,000	450,000	450,000	-53,000
	Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	1,661,000	1,451,000	1,451,000	-210,000
	BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
91-50	Construction (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(998,000)	(998,000)	(998,000)	
91-50	Operation and maintenance (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(643,000)	(643,000)	(643,000)	
91-50	Construction of electric transmission lines and substations, contributions, Bonneville Power Project (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(1,000)	(1,000)	(1,000)	
	Total, Bonneville Power Administration (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(1,642,000)	(1,642,000)	(1,642,000)	
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	298,000	298,000	298,000	
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	454,000	454,000	454,000	
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR				
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
	OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH				
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	31,000	31,000	31,000	
	Total, Department of the Interior:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	7,123,000	7,663,000	7,663,000	+540,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(2,575,000)	(2,575,000)	(2,575,000)	
	<i>By transfer</i>	(1,846,000)	(1,096,000)	(1,096,000)	(-750,000)
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
91-50	Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(88,000)	(88,000)	(88,000)	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued					
	FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	\$9,220,000	\$9,220,000	\$9,220,000		
	IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE					
91-98	Salaries and expenses.....	3,276,000	3,276,000	3,276,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(270,000)</i>	<i>(270,000)</i>	<i>(270,000)</i>		
	LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION					
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	<i>(57,000)</i>	<i>(57,000)</i>	<i>(57,000)</i>		
	Total, Department of Justice:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....					
	<i>Release of Public Law 964 reserves.....</i>	12,496,000	12,496,000	12,496,000		
		<i>(415,000)</i>	<i>(415,000)</i>	<i>(415,000)</i>		
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
	MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION					
91-50	Manpower development and training activities, salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	<i>(92,000)</i>	<i>(92,000)</i>	<i>(92,000)</i>		
91-94	Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	<i>(313,000)</i>	<i>(313,000)</i>	<i>(313,000)</i>		
91-50	Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses:					
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	<i>(50,000)</i>	<i>(50,000)</i>	<i>(50,000)</i>		

	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i>	(363,000)	(363,000)	(363,000)	-----
	Total, Manpower Administration (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(818,000)	(818,000)	(818,000)	-----
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY				=====
91-50	Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses:				-----
	(<i>Increase in amount available for administrative expenses</i>).....	(865,000)	(865,000)	(865,000)	-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)	-----
	LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS				=====
91-50	Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(448,000)	(448,000)	(448,000)	-----
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS				=====
91-50	Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses:				-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(120,000)	(120,000)	(120,000)	-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i>	(152,000)	(152,000)	(152,000)	-----
91-50	Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(992,000)	(992,000)	(992,000)	-----
	Total, Wage and Labor Standards (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(1,264,000)	(1,264,000)	(1,264,000)	-----
	BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS				=====
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	93,000	93,000	93,000	-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i>	(87,000)	(87,000)	(87,000)	-----
	BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS				=====
91-50	Salaries and expenses:				-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(14,000)	(14,000)	(14,000)	-----
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)</i>	(60,000)	(60,000)	(60,000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-50	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued					
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
	Salaries and expenses:					
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto).....</i>	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)		
91-50	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
	Salaries and expenses:					
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	(110,000)	(110,000)	(110,000)		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto).....</i>	(121,000)	(121,000)	(121,000)		
91-50	OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM					
	Salaries and expenses:					
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	(3,000)	(3,000)	(3,000)		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto).....</i>	(39,000)	(39,000)	(39,000)		
	Total, Department of Labor:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	93,000	93,000	93,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....</i>	(4,010,000)	(4,010,000)	(4,010,000)		
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses.....</i>	(865,000)	(865,000)	(865,000)		

S. Doc. 91-18	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (Out of Postal Fund)			
	Administration and regional operations:			
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(2,107,000)	(2,107,000)	(2,107,000)
91-18	Research, development, and engineering.....	500,000	500,000	500,000
91-18	Operations.....	195,071,000	195,071,000	195,071,000
	<i>By transfer</i>	(62,000,000)	(62,000,000)	(62,000,000)
	Total, Post Office Department:			
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	195,571,000	195,571,000	195,571,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(2,107,000)	(2,107,000)	(2,107,000)
	<i>By transfer</i>	(62,000,000)	(62,000,000)	(62,000,000)
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
91-94	Salaries and expenses.....	6,787,000	6,787,000	6,787,000
	<i>By transfer</i>	(833,000)	(833,000)	(833,000)
	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES			
91-94	Missions to international organizations.....	153,000	153,000	153,000
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS			
91-50	International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:			
	Salaries and expenses.....	43,000	43,000	43,000
	Operation and maintenance.....	29,000	29,000	29,000
91-50	American sections, international commissions.....	19,000	19,000	19,000
	Total, international commissions.....	91,000	91,000	91,000
	EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE			
91-50	Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities.....	425,000	425,000	425,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE—Continued					
	OTHER					
91-50	Migration and refugee assistance.....	\$26, 000	\$26, 000	\$26, 000		
	Total, Department of State:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	7, 482, 000	7, 482, 000	7, 482, 000		
	<i>By transfer</i>	(882, 000)	(882, 000)	(882, 000)		
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	445, 000	100, 000	100, 000	—\$345, 000	
	COAST GUARD					
91-50	Operating expenses.....	10, 000, 000	9, 500, 000	9, 500, 000	—500, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(82, 000)	(82, 000)	(82, 000)		
91-50	Acquisition, construction, and improvements (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(51, 000)	(51, 000)	(51, 000)		
91-50	Reserve training.....	1, 000, 000	900, 000	900, 000	—100, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(40, 000)	(40, 000)	(40, 000)		
	Total, Coast Guard.....	11, 000, 000	10, 400, 000	10, 400, 000	—600, 000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(173, 000)	(173, 000)	(173, 000)		
	FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION					
91-50	Operations.....	30, 800, 000	30, 400, 000	30, 400, 000	—400, 000	

91-50	Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports.....	254, 000	220, 000	220, 000	-34, 000
	Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	31, 054, 000	30, 620, 000	30, 620, 000	-434, 000
	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION				
91-50	Highway beautification.....	64, 000	64, 000	64, 000	
91-50	Traffic and highway safety (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(210, 000)			(-210, 000)
91-50	Motor carrier safety.....	68, 000	68, 000	68, 000	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(22, 000)	(22, 000)	(22, 000)	
91-50	Limitation on general expenses:				
	Increase in limitation on administrative expenses.....	(1, 875, 000)	(875, 000)	(875, 000)	(-1, 000, 000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(641, 000)	(641, 000)	(641, 000)	
	Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	132, 000	132, 000	132, 000	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(873, 000)	(863, 000)	(863, 000)	(-210, 000)
	Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(1, 875, 000)	(875, 000)	(875, 000)	(-1, 000, 000)
	FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION				
91-50	Salaries and expenses (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(35, 000)	(35, 000)	(35, 000)	
91-50	Bureau of Railroad Safety.....	140, 000	90, 000	90, 000	-50, 000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(39, 000)	(83, 000)	(83, 000)	(+44, 000)
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	140, 000	90, 000	90, 000	-50, 000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(74, 000)	(118, 000)	(118, 000)	(+44, 000)
	URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION				
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	31, 000			-31, 000
	Total, Department of Transportation:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	42, 802, 000	41, 342, 000	41, 342, 000	-1, 460, 000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(1, 120, 000)	(954, 000)	(954, 000)	(-166, 000)
	Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(1, 875, 000)	(875, 000)	(875, 000)	(-1, 000, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT					
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
91-85	Salaries and expenses.....	\$257,000	\$257,000	\$257,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(134,000)	(134,000)	(134,000)		
	BUREAU OF CUSTOMS					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	2,637,000	2,637,000	2,637,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(1,550,000)	(1,550,000)	(1,550,000)		
	BUREAU OF THE MINT					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	630,000	500,000	500,000	—\$130,000	
	INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE					
91-85	Salaries and expenses.....	450,000	425,000	425,000	—25,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(564,000)	(564,000)	(564,000)		
91-50	Revenue accounting and processing.....	5,592,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	—1,092,000	
91-85	Compliance.....	3,300,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	—500,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(20,360,000)	(20,360,000)	(20,360,000)		
	Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	9,342,000	7,725,000	7,725,000	—1,617,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(20,924,000)	(20,924,000)	(20,924,000)		
	OFFICE OF THE TREASURER					
91-50	Salaries and expenses.....	167,000	167,000	167,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(85,000)	(85,000)	(85,000)		

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE			
91-50	Salaries and expenses	1,338,000	1,338,000
	Total, Treasury Department:		
	New budget (obligational) authority	14,371,000	12,624,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(22,693,000)	(22,693,000)
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION		
91-50	Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	3,671,000	3,671,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(677,000)	(677,000)
91-94	Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	300,000	300,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(95,000)	(95,000)
91-50	Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service (release of Public Law 90-364 reserves)	(5,000)	(5,000)
91-50	Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service (release of Public Law 90-364 reserves)	(38,000)	(38,000)
91-94	Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator	119,000	119,000
91-50	Administrative operations fund (release of Public Law 90-364 reserves)	(107,000)	(107,000)
	Total, General Services Administration:		
	New budget (obligational) authority	4,090,000	4,090,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(922,000)	(922,000)
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION		
91-50	Medical and prosthetic research	1,168,000	1,168,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(362,000)	(362,000)
91-50	Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	589,000	589,000
	Total, Veterans' Administration: New budget (obligational) authority	1,757,000	1,757,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(362,000)	(362,000)

-1,747,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES						
91-50	American Battle Monuments Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	\$33,000	\$33,000	\$33,000		
91-50	Arms Control and Disarmament Agency: Arms control and disarmament activities (<i>release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>).....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(15,000)		
91-50	Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses.....	500,000	500,000	500,000		
91-94	Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	1,364,000	1,364,000	1,364,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(89,000)	(89,000)	(89,000)		
91-50	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	370,000	370,000	370,000		
91-50	Export-Import Bank:					
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(172,000)			(- \$172,000)	
91-85	Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses:					
	<i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(97,000)	(97,000)	(97,000)		
91-94	Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	970,000	970,000	970,000		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(16,000)	(16,000)	(+16,000)		
91-50	Federal Home Loan Bank Board:					
	Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses:					
	<i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(115,000)	(115,000)	(115,000)		
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(102,000)	(102,000)	(102,000)		

S. Doc. 91-18	Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation:	(4,000)	-----	(4,000)	-----	(+84,000)
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>					
91-94	Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(76,000)	(76,000)	(76,000)	(76,000)	
91-50	Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses.....	125,000	125,000	125,000	125,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(8,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	(8,000)	
91-50	Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	778,000	778,000	778,000	778,000	
S. Doc. 91-18	Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	41,000	32,000	41,000	41,000	+9,000
91-50	Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	818,000	818,000	818,000	818,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(382,000)	(382,000)	(382,000)	(382,000)	
91-50	National Capital Planning Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	
91-50	National Commission on Product Safety: Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	
91-85	National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses.....	400,000	250,000	400,000	400,000	+150,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(848,000)	(848,000)	(848,000)	(848,000)	
91-50	Railroad Retirement Board: Limitation on salaries and expenses (<i>increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>).....	(516,000)	(516,000)	(516,000)	(516,000)	
91-50	Renegotiation Board: Salaries and expenses.....	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	
91-94	Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	694,000	594,000	694,000	594,000	-100,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(199,000)	(299,000)	(299,000)	(299,000)	(+100,000)
91-50	Small Business Administration: Salaries and expenses.....	418,000	200,000	418,000	200,000	-218,000
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(265,000)	(265,000)	(265,000)	(265,000)	
91-50	Smithsonian Institution:					
	Salaries and expenses.....	695,000	695,000	695,000	695,000	
	<i>Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves</i>	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)	(125,000)	

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

91-50	Parks and recreation.....	(392,000)	(322,000)	(322,000)	(-70,000)	-----
91-50	Health and welfare.....	(2,437,000)	(2,437,000)	(2,437,000)	-----	-----
91-50	Highways and traffic.....	(208,000)	(168,000)	(168,000)	(-40,000)	-----
91-50	Sanitary engineering.....	(227,000)	(227,000)	(227,000)	-----	-----
91-50	Personal services, wage-board employees.....	(3,179,000)	(3,179,000)	(3,179,000)	-----	-----
	Total, District of Columbia.....	(6,438,000)	(6,323,000)	(6,323,000)	(-110,000)	=====
	Total, title III:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,464,734,396	1,183,298,454	1,368,137,556	-96,596,840	+184,839,102
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(59,510,000)	(62,277,000)	(59,741,000)	(+231,000)	(-2,536,000)
	By trans et.....	(36,873,000)	(31,676,000)	(37,916,000)	(+2,043,000)	(+6,240,000)
	Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....	(24,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(-2,000,000)	-----

Calendar No. 218

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

[Report No. 91-228]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 23, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 11, 1969

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1969, by
Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
5 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second
6 Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TITLE I

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
Army”, \$110,000,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
Navy”, ~~\$14,500,000~~ \$21,500,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Military personnel,
Air Force”, ~~\$115,000,000~~ \$146,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
tenance, Army”, \$96,310,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
tenance, Marine Corps”, \$15,390,000, *and in addition,*
\$8,910,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropria-
tion “Procurement, Marine Corps”.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for “Operation and main-
tenance, Air Force”, \$242,700,000.

1 **PROCUREMENT**

2 **PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES, ARMY**

3 For an additional amount for "Procurement of equip-
4 ment and missiles, Army", \$640,100,000, to remain avail-
5 able until expended.

6 **TITLE II**

7 **CHAPTER I**

8 **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

9 **AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE**

10 **SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

11 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
12 for "Plant and animal disease and pest control", \$1,400,000.

13 **EXTENSION SERVICE**

14 **COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES**

15 For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension
16 work, payments and expenses", for "Retirement and employ-
17 ees' compensation costs for extension agents", \$218,000.

18 *SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE*

19 *FLOOD PREVENTION*

20 *For an additional amount for "Flood prevention", \$4,*
21 *000,000 to remain available until expended for emergency*
22 *measures for runoff retardation and soil erosion preven-*
23 *tion, as provided by section 216 of the Flood Control Act*
24 *of 1950 (33 U.S.C. 701 b-1).*

1 AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION
2 SERVICE

3 SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

4 For an additional amount for “Sugar Act program”,
5 \$7,500,000.

6 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

7 EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

8 There may be transferred to the Emergency Credit Re-
9 volving Fund not to exceed \$25,000,000 of the unobligated
10 funds in the Direct Loan Account, to be reimbursed to the
11 Direct Loan Account from repayments of loans made from
12 the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund.

13 CHAPTER II

14 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

15 MILITARY PERSONNEL

16 RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

17 For an additional amount for “Reserve personnel,
18 Navy”, \$4,150,000.

19 RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

20 For an additional amount for “Reserve personnel, Ma-
21 rine Corps”, ~~\$4,500,000~~ *\$6,400,000*.

22 RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

23 For an additional amount for “Retired pay, Defense”,
24 \$175,000,000.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

2 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

3 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
4 nance, Navy", \$20,000,000.

5 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

6 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
7 nance, Marine Corps", \$3,600,000, *and in addition, \$1,000,-*
8 *000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Pro-*
9 *curement, Marine Corps"*.

10 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

11 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
12 nance, Army National Guard", \$10,000,000, *and in addi-*
13 *tion, \$3,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appro-*
14 *priation "Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation,*
15 *Army"*.

16 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

17 For an additional amount for "Operation and mainte-
18 nance, Air National Guard", \$8,800,000, *and in addition,*
19 *\$5,377,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation*
20 *"Other Procurement, Air Force"*.

21 GENERAL PROVISION

22 ~~SEC. 201.~~ Deficiencies incurred under the terms of sec-
23 tion ~~3732~~ of the Revised Statutes, as amended (~~41 U.S.C.~~
24 ~~41~~), shall not exceed the amounts of the estimates in House

1 Documents Numbered 91-50 and 91-94, or the amounts
2 provided herein, whichever is lower, for each such author-
3 ized purpose.

4 CHAPTER III

5 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

6 FEDERAL FUNDS

7 FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

8 For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the
9 District of Columbia", for the general fund of the District
10 of Columbia, \$10,365,000.

11 *LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL*

12 *OUTLAY*

13 *For an additional amount for "Loans to the District of*
14 *Columbia for capital outlay", for the general fund of the*
15 *District of Columbia, \$18,736,000.*

16 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

17 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

18 For an additional amount for "General operating ex-
19 penses", \$975,000, of which \$1,000 shall be payable from
20 the highway fund.

21 PUBLIC SAFETY

22 For an additional amount for "Public safety", \$10,034,-
23 000, of which \$95,000 for the Department of Corrections
24 shall remain available until September 30, 1969, and of

1 which \$528,000 shall be payable from the highway fund,
2 and of which \$1,302,000 shall be available for the fiscal year
3 1968.

4 EDUCATION

5 For an additional amount for "Education", \$13,931,000.

6 HEALTH AND WELFARE

7 For an additional amount for "Health and welfare",
8 \$111,000.

9 SANITARY ENGINEERING

10 For an additional amount for "Sanitary engineering",
11 \$252,000.

12 SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

13 For payment of claims in excess of \$250, approved by
14 the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of the
15 Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46
16 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$50,000.

17 CAPITAL OUTLAY

18 *For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", \$18,-*
19 *736,000, of which \$1,514,000 shall not be available for*
20 *expenditure until July 1, 1969.*

21 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

22 The sums appropriated herein for the District of Co-
23 lumbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be
24 paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

1 CHAPTER IV
2 FOREIGN OPERATIONS
3 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
4 WELFARE
5 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

6 ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

7 For an additional amount for "Assistance to refugees
8 in the United States", \$2,700,000 *to be derived by transfer*
9 *from appropriations for "Economic Assistance", fiscal year*
10 *1969, of the Agency for International Development, and, in*
11 *addition, \$35,000 which shall be derived by transfer from*
12 *"Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal year*
13 *1969.*

14 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

15 INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

16 SUBSCRIPTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

17 ASSOCIATION

18 *For payment of the first installment of the United States*
19 *share of the 1969-1971 increase in the resources of the Inter-*
20 *national Development Association, as authorized by law,*
21 *\$160,000,000, to remain available until expended.*

CHAPTER V

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, telecommunications", ~~\$500,000~~ \$777,000, to remain available until expended.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$600,000 *of which \$100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969*; (and release of \$81,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

1 *NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION*2 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

3 *The appropriation granted under this head in the Inde-*
 4 *pendent Offices Appropriation Act, 1969, shall be avail-*
 5 *able for the purchase of one aircraft for replacement only.*

6 *SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM*7 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

8 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
 9 ~~\$2,573,000~~ \$3,139,000.

10 *VETERANS ADMINISTRATION*11 *COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS*

12 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
 13 sions", ~~\$179,000,000~~ \$276,600,000, to remain available
 14 until expended.

15 *READJUSTMENT BENEFITS*

16 For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits",
 17 ~~\$14,200,000~~ \$89,200,000, to remain available until
 18 expended.

19 *MEDICAL CARE*

20 For an additional amount for "Medical care", ~~\$46,189,-~~
 21 ~~000~~ \$53,800,000: (and release of \$15,167,000 reserved
 22 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
 23 Law 90-364).

24 *GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES*

25 For an additional amount for "General operating ex-
 26 penses", \$12,000,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

2 DEVELOPMENT

3 MORTGAGE CREDIT

4 HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

5 The limitation on total payments that may be required
 6 in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section
 7 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat.
 8 477), is increased by ~~\$40,000,000~~ \$50,000,000 and the
 9 limitation on total payments under those entered into under
 10 section 236 of such Act (82 Stat. 498) is increased by
 11 ~~\$40,000,000~~ \$50,000,000.

12 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

13 COLLEGE HOUSING

14 The limitation on total payments that may be required
 15 in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with
 16 educational institutions entered into pursuant to section 401
 17 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604),
 18 is increased by \$2,500,000.

19 LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

20 For additional amounts for "Low rent public housing
 21 annual contributions", \$7,168,000 for the fiscal year 1968,
 22 and \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969.

23 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

24 FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM

25 For an additional amount for "Fair housing program",
 26 \$1,000,000.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources", \$10,410,000; and in addition, \$1,803,000 (including \$175,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Water supply and water pollution control", fiscal year 1969; (and release of \$275,000 reserved under "Management of lands and resources" pursuant to said section 201).

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Education and welfare services", \$2,781,000.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", ~~\$2,769,000~~ \$2,700,000, of which \$150,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969; (and release of \$426,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For a repayable advance to the "Land and water conservation fund", as authorized by section 4(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-7), for liquidation of obligations incurred against such fund pursuant to law, \$19,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For an additional amount for "Land and water conservation", to be derived from the "Land and water conservation fund" and to remain available until expended for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to section 3 (b) (1) of the Act of October 2, 1968 (Public Law 90-545), \$19,000,000.

OFFICE OF THE TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Administration of territories", \$950,000, to remain available until expended.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations, and research", ~~\$2,092,000~~ \$2,242,000, of which \$300,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

1 BUREAU OF MINES

2 HEALTH AND SAFETY

3 For an additional amount for "Health and safety",
 4 \$750,000 to remain available until September 30, 1969.

5 HELIUM FUND

6 For an additional amount of borrowing authority for
 7 the "Helium fund", ~~\$5,000,000~~ \$10,000,000, to remain
 8 available without fiscal year limitation.

9 OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
 12 \$48,000.

13 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

14 PAYMENT TO FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND

15 For payment to "Fishermen's Protective Fund", estab-
 16 lished pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1968 (82 Stat.
 17 729), \$60,000, to remain available until expended.

18 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

19 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

20 For an additional amount for "Management and investi-
 21 gations of resources", \$1,353,000, of which \$250,000 shall
 22 remain available until September 30, 1969; (and release of

1 \$139,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
 2 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364).

3 CONSTRUCTION

4 For an additional amount for "Construction", ~~\$200,000~~
 5 ~~\$400,000~~, to remain available until expended.

6 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

7 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

8 For an additional amount for "Management and pro-
 9 tection", ~~\$2,479,000~~ ~~\$2,366,000~~; (and release of \$195,000
 10 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
 11 Public Law 90-364).

12 CONSTRUCTION

13 For an additional amount for "Construction", ~~\$100,000~~
 14 ~~\$1,103,000~~, to remain available until expended.

15 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

16 FOREST SERVICE

17 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

18 For an additional amount for "Forest protection and
 19 utilization", as follows: "Forest land management", ~~\$25,-~~
 20 ~~028,000~~ ~~\$24,374,000~~, of which ~~\$460,000~~ shall remain
 21 available until September 30, 1969; "Forest research",
 22 \$1,564,000; and "State and private forestry cooperation",
 23 \$124,000: (and release of \$1,676,000 reserved under "For-

1 est protection and utilization” pursuant to section 201 of
2 Public Law 90-364).

3 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
4 HUMANITIES

5 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

6 For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses”,
7 equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of
8 money, and other property received *prior to September 1,*
9 *1969* by each Endowment under the provisions of section
10 10 (a) (2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and
11 the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, not to exceed a
12 total of \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

13 CHAPTER VII

14 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

15 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

16 UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL

17 EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

18 For an additional amount for “Unemployment com-
19 pensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen”,
20 \$20,000,000.

21 MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

22 MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

23 For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of
24 section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act
25 of 1962, as amended, \$7,500,000, to remain available until
26 September 30, 1969.

1 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

2 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

3 EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION CLAIMS AND EXPENSES

4 For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation
5 claims and expenses", \$15,900,000.

6 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
7 WELFARE

8 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

9 HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

10 For an additional amount for "Higher educational ac-
11 tivities", \$19,920,000 including payments authorized by
12 section 108(b) of the District of Columbia Public Education
13 Act, as amended (Public Law 90-354, approved June 20,
14 1968), and annual interest grants authorized by section 306
15 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public
16 Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), \$11,161,000, of
17 which \$3,920,000 shall remain available until expended for
18 said annual interest grants: *Provided*, That, in addition,
19 \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Community
20 mental health resource support", Public Health Service,
21 fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds
22 appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants author-
23 ized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act,
24 as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formu-
25 late or carry out any grant to any institution of higher edu-

1 eation unless such institution is in full compliance with
 2 section 504 of such Act of which \$3,920,000 shall be for
 3 annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher
 4 Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575,
 5 approved October 16, 1968), to remain available until ex-
 6 pended for said annual interest grants, and \$16,000,000
 7 shall be for educational opportunity grants under part A of
 8 title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, to
 9 remain available through June 30, 1970: Provided, That, in
 10 addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Com-
 11 munity mental health resource support", Public Health Service,
 12 fiscal year 1969: Provided further, That none of the funds
 13 appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants author-
 14 ized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act,
 15 as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formu-
 16 late or carry out any grant to any institution of higher
 17 education unless such institution is in full compliance with
 18 section 504 of such Act.

19 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

20 OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

21 COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES

22 For an additional amount for "Comprehensive health
 23 planning and services", \$9,186,000, to remain available
 24 until September 30, 1969, to be derived by transfer from
 25 "Community mental health resource support", Public
 26 Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$292,000

reserved under "Comprehensive health planning and services" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) :
Provided, That the amount made available under "Comprehensive health planning and services" in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1969, for grants under section 314 (a) of the Public Health Service Act is reduced from "\$7,375,000" to \$7,125,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

For grants and loans pursuant to the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457), \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for maintenance payments"; "Grants to States for medical assistance"; and "Social services, administration, training, and demonstration projects"; \$651,546,000.

ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES NATIONALS

For an additional amount for "Assistance for repatriated United States nationals", \$100,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses," Social Security Administration, \$21,200,000, to be expended, as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of

1 *the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all*
2 *of the trust funds referred to therein.*

3 CHAPTER VIII

4 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

5 SENATE

6 *For payment to Vide G. Bartlett, widow of E. L.*
7 *Bartlett, late a Senator from the State of Alaska, \$30,000.*

8 *The clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the States*
9 *of Illinois and Texas shall be increased to that allowed Sen-*
10 *ators from States having a population of eleven million, the*
11 *population of said States having exceeded eleven million*
12 *inhabitants.*

13 *For an additional amount for "Inquiries and Investi-*
14 *gations", fiscal year 1968, \$126,900.*

15 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

16 *For payment to Lelia Ashton Everett, mother of Robert*
17 *A. Everett, late a Representative from the State of Ten-*
18 *nessee, \$30,000.*

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

Miscellaneous items: The limitation under this head, fiscal year 1969, on the payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812), is hereby increased by \$36,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

House office buildings: From and after March 1, 1969, the compensation of the Superintendent of Garages shall be at the basic annual rate of \$5,270.

CHAPTER IX

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control and coastal emergencies", \$25,000,000, to remain until expended.

1 *INDEPENDENT OFFICES*2 *ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION*3 *PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT*

4 *For and additional amount for "Plant and Capital*
 5 *Equipment", \$45,000,000, to remain available until ex-*
 6 *pended.*

7 *CHAPTER IX X*8 *DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE*9 *LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION*10 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION*

11 *For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,*
 12 *general administration", \$65,000, of which \$40,000 shall*
 13 *remain available until September 30, 1969, and, in addition,*
 14 *\$231,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the*
 15 *amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law En-*
 16 *forcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to section*
 17 *201 of Public Law 90-364, and \$2,000 which shall be de-*
 18 *rived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries*
 19 *and expenses, Community Relations Service", pursuant to*
 20 *said section 201.*

21 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES*

22 *For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,*
 23 *general legal activities", \$1,314,000 \$1,277,000, of which*

1 *\$101,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969,*
2 and, in addition, \$100,000 which shall be derived by trans-
3 fer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses",
4 Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to
5 section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$100,-
6 000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses, general legal
7 activities" pursuant to said section 201) .

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

9 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
10 Antitrust Division", \$99,000, and, in addition, \$262,000
11 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved
12 under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance
13 Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
14 364; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under "Salaries and
15 expenses, Antitrust Division" pursuant to said section 201) .

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

17 AND MARSHALS

18 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
19 United States attorneys and marshals", \$2,505,000 of which
20 *\$162,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;*
21 (and release of \$150,000 reserved under this appropriation
22 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) .

1 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

3 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses,
4 Bureau of Prisons", \$2,319,000; (and release of \$250,000
5 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
6 of Public Law 90-364).

7 SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

8 For an additional amount for "Support of United States
9 Prisoners", \$2,500,000.

10 BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
13 \$1,187,000 *of which \$737,000 shall remain available until*
14 *September 30, 1969*; (and release of \$400,000 reserved
15 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
16 Law 90-364).

17 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

18 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

19 OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

20 The amount required to be advanced from "Operations
21 and administration" to the Small Business Administration
22 during the current fiscal year for the processing of loan appli-
23 cations is hereby reduced to \$1,200,000; (and release of
24 \$116,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
25 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364).

1 *ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION*

2 *SALARIES AND EXPENSES*

3 *In addition to the amount made available in the appro-*
 4 *priation under this head in the Department of Commerce*
 5 *Appropriation Act, 1969, for retirement pay of commissioned*
 6 *officers and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family*
 7 *Protection Plan, \$147,000 shall be available in that appro-*
 8 *priation for such expenses.*

9 **MARITIME ADMINISTRATION**

10 **STATE MARINE SCHOOLS**

11 For an additional amount for "State marine schools",
 12 for liquidation of obligations incurred for payment of allow-
 13 ances for uniforms, textbooks and subsistence of cadets at
 14 State marine schools, to remain available until expended,
 15 \$210,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
 16 for "Ship construction".

17 **THE JUDICIARY**

18 **SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES**

19 **PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS**

20 For an additional amount for "Printing and binding
 21 Supreme Court reports", \$27,000.

22 For an additional amount for "Printing and binding
 23 Supreme Court reports", fiscal year 1968, \$10,000.

1 CUSTOMS COURT

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
4 \$113,000.

5 COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

6 JUDICIAL SERVICES

7 SALARIES OF JUDGES

8 For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges",
9 ~~\$1,975,000~~ \$1,948,000.

10 SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

11 For an additional amount for "Salaries of supporting
12 personnel", \$2,412,000 of which \$205,000 shall remain
13 available until September 30, 1969.

14 FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

15 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
16 court-appointed counsel", fiscal year 1968, \$850,000.

17 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
18 court-appointed counsel", fiscal year 1969, \$850,000.

19 TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

20 For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous
21 expenses", \$400,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of the United States Courts", \$97,500, of which \$10,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969, and, in addition, \$10,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Expenses of referees", fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER X XI

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1969, for necessary expenses in connection with the consolidation of Departmental activities into the Southwest Area of Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$298,000; (and release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

1 COAST GUARD

2 RETIRED PAY

3 For an additional amount for "Retired pay",
4 \$2,000,000.

5 CHAPTER ~~XI~~ XII

6 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

7 BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

8 ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

9 For an additional amount for "Administering the public
10 debt", \$1,978,000; (and release of \$334,000 reserved under
11 this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
12 90-364).

13 U.S. SECRET SERVICE

14 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
16 \$470,000.

17 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

18 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
21 ~~\$107,000~~ \$100,000.

22 NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
25 ~~\$200,000~~ \$147,000.

CHAPTER ~~XII~~ XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in *Senate Documents Numbered 18 and 22 and House Document Numbered 101, Ninety-first Congress, \$~~16,880,812~~ \$18,188,688*, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE III

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1969, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

“Compensation of the Vice President and Senators”,
\$458,270;

“Salaries, officers and employees”, \$1,647,837;

“Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate”,
\$21,905;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

“Senate policy committees,” \$27,190;

“Automobiles and maintenance,” \$2,180;

“Inquiries and investigations”, \$370,640; including
\$14,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;

“Folding documents”, \$2,565;

“Miscellaneous items”, \$169,015, including
\$100,500 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol
in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82,
approved July 6, 1961;

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

Compensation of Members, \$1,975,000;

SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

“Office of the Speaker”, \$4,015;

“Office of the Parliamentarian”, \$12,935;

“Compilation of precedents of House of Representa-
tives”, \$670;

1 “Office of the Chaplain”, \$1,250;

2 “Office of the Clerk”, \$110,000;

3 “Office of the Sergeant at Arms”, \$192,000;

4 “Office of the Doorkeeper”, \$65,000;

5 “Office of the Postmaster”, \$40,875;

6 “Committee employees”, \$400,000;

7 Special and minority employees:

8 “Minority employees”, \$11,410;

9 “House Democratic steering committee”, \$3,760;

10 “House Republican conference”, \$3,760;

11 “Majority leader”, \$4,800;

12 “Minority leader”, \$4,005;

13 “Majority whip”, \$3,885;

14 “Minority whip”, \$3,885;

15 “Printing clerks”, \$980;

16 “Official reporters of debates”, \$27,000;

17 “Official reporters to committees”, \$24,760;

18 “Office of the legislative counsel”, \$25,600;

19 MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE

20 “Members' clerk hire”, \$3,050,000;

21 Contingent Expenses of the House

22 “Special and select committees”, \$129,000;

23 “Revision of laws”, \$1,490;

24 “Speaker's automobile”, \$665;

1 "Majority leader's automobile", \$665;

2 "Minority leader's automobile", \$665;

3 JOINT ITEMS

4 Contingent Expenses of the Senate

5 "Joint Economic Committee", \$13,500;

6 "Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", \$17,820;

7 "Joint Committee on Printing", \$12,425;

8 Contingent Expenses of the House

9 "Joint Committee on Defense Production", \$7,950;

10 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

11 Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries",
12 \$36,000;

13 Capitol buildings and grounds:

14 "Capitol buildings", \$74,500;

15 "Capitol grounds", \$25,600;

16 "*Senate office buildings*", \$174,000;

17 "*Senate garage*", \$6,500;

18 "House office buildings", \$300,000;

19 "Capitol power plant", \$27,500;

20 Library buildings and grounds: "Structural and me-
21 chanical care", \$28,000;

22 BOTANIC GARDEN

23 "Salaries and expenses", \$22,500;

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$579,300: *Provided*, That \$75,000 of the amount allocated for rental of space under this head, fiscal year 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

Copyright Office: “Salaries and expenses”, \$109,800;

Legislative Reference Service: “Salaries and expenses”, \$170,000, and in addition, \$50,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation “Salaries and expenses”, distribution of catalog cards;

Distribution of catalog cards: Not to exceed \$150,000 of the \$200,000 reserve fund under this head, fiscal year 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents: “Salaries and expenses”, \$6,000;

“Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)”, \$9,000;

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Office of Superintendent of Documents: “Salaries and expenses”, \$178,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the \$200,000 reserve fund under this head, fiscal year 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

1 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

2 “Salaries and expenses”, ~~\$2,214,000~~ \$2,114,000;

3 THE JUDICIARY

4 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

5 “Salaries”, \$120,000;

6 “Care of the building and grounds”, \$15,900;

7 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$16,000;

9 COURT OF CLAIMS

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$64,000;

11 COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

12 JUDICIAL SERVICES

13 “Expenses of referees”, \$248,000, to be derived from
14 the “Referees’ salary and expense fund”;15 “Salaries of referees”, \$404,000, to be derived from the
16 “Referees’ salary and expense fund”;

17 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

18 COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

19 For an additional amount for “Compensation of the
20 President”, \$44,584;

21 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

22 “Salaries and expenses”, \$50,000; (and release of
23 \$355,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
24 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000; (and release of \$70,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Salaries and expenses, Telecommunications”; (Release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies”, \$30,000; (and release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

“Salaries and expenses”, (Release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$32,000;

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

“Administrative expenses”, Agency for International Development, \$1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for “Economic assistance”, fiscal year 1969;

“Administrative and other expenses”, Department of State, \$75,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for “Economic assistance”, fiscal year 1969;

1 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

2 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

3 “Salaries and expenses”; (Release of \$6,615,000 re-
4 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
5 Public Law 90-364) ;

6 COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

7 “Payments and expenses”; (Release of \$81,000 re-
8 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
9 Public Law 90-364) ;

10 FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

11 “Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses”;
12 (Release of \$135,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
13 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

14 FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$73,000;

16 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

17 “Conservation operations”, \$3,980,000; (and release
18 of \$1,000,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant
19 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

20 “Watershed planning”, \$254,000; (and release of
21 \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
22 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

23 “River basin surveys and investigations”, \$306,000;
24 (and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation
25 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 “Watershed works of improvement”, \$688,000; (and
2 release of \$300,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
3 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 “Flood prevention”, \$224,000; (and release of \$128,-
5 000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
6 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 “Great Plains conservation program”, \$160,000;

8 “Resource conservation and development”, \$111,000;
9 (and release of \$100,000 reserved under this appropriation
10 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$684,000;

13 STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$527,000;

15 CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

16 “Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory pro-
17 grams”, ~~\$2,300,000~~ \$2,000,000; (and release of \$600,000
18 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
19 of Public Law 90-364) .

20 “Special milk program”; (Release of \$15,000 reserved
21 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
22 Law 90-364) ;

23 FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

24 “Salaries and expenses”, \$362,000, to be derived by
25 transfer from “Cropland adjustment program”, Agricultural

1 Stabilization and Conservation Service, fiscal year 1969;
2 (and release of \$68,000 reserved under "Salaries and ex-
3 penses", Foreign Agricultural Service, pursuant to section
4 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$65,000;

7 AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION
8 SERVICE

9 "Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation
10 Service", \$4,108,000 of which \$1,826,000 shall be derived
11 by transfer from "Cropland adjustment program", fiscal year
12 1969, \$1,560,000, from "Cropland conversion program",
13 and \$722,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation
14 Fund; (and release of \$551,000 reserved under "Expenses,
15 Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service", pur-
16 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

17 RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$18,000;- (and release of
19 \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
20 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

21 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$568,000;

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$49,000; (and release of \$64,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

“Salaries and expenses”, \$239,000;

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$58,000;

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$40,000; (and release of \$35,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

“Salaries and expenses”, \$116,000; (and release of \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$224,000, of which \$36,000 shall be derived by transfer from “Payments and expenses”, Cooperative State Research Service, (and release of \$30,000 reserved under “Salaries and expenses” pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$624,000; (and release of
3 \$11,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
4 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$2,094,000, of which \$13,000
7 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under
8 “Salaries and expenses”, Agricultural Research Service pur-
9 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, \$158,000 from
10 “Payments and expenses”, Cooperative State Research Serv-
11 ice (including \$44,000 from the amount reserved pursuant
12 to said section 201), \$2,000 from the amount reserved
13 under “Cooperative extension work, payments and ex-
14 penses”, Federal Extension Service pursuant to said section
15 201, \$150,000 from “Payments to States and possessions”,
16 Consumer and Marketing Service, and \$412,000 from “Crop-
17 land adjustment program”, Agricultural Stabilization and
18 Conservation Service; (and release of \$156,000 reserved
19 under “Salaries and expenses”, Farmers Home Administra-
20 tion pursuant to said section 201) ;

21 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

22 “Administrative and operating expenses”, \$274,000;
23 (and release of \$97,000 reserved under this appropriation
24 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$293,000, of which \$75,000 shall be derived by transfer from “Operations and administration”, Economic Development Assistance;

OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$75,000, to be derived by transfer from “Operations and administration”, Economic Development Assistance; (and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$567,000;

“1967 economic censuses”, \$285,000;

BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$206,000; (and release of \$36,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Salaries and expenses”, \$200,000; (and release of \$163,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Export control”, \$136,000; (and release of \$60,000

1 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
2 Public Law 90-364) ;

3 OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$142,000; (and release of
5 \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
6 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,254,000; (and release of
9 \$786,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
10 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

11 "Research and development", \$614,000; (and release
12 of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
13 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

14 PATENT OFFICE

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,240,000; (and release of
16 \$321,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
17 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

18 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

19 "Research and technical services", \$1,100,000;

20 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

21 "Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses,
22 \$261,000;

1 “Maritime training”, \$100,000; (and release of \$99,000
2 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
3 Public Law 90-364) ;

4 FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

5 “Salaries and expenses”, \$173,000;

6 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

7 MILITARY PERSONNEL

8 “Military personnel, Army”, ~~\$230,000,000~~ \$300,000,-
9 000;

10 “Military personnel, Navy”, ~~\$160,000,000~~ \$198,700,-
11 000;

12 “Military personnel, Marine Corps”, ~~\$45,000,000~~ \$61,-
13 500,000;

14 “Military personnel, Air Force”, ~~\$214,000,000~~ \$267,-
15 600,000;

16 “National Guard personnel, Army”, ~~\$13,000,000~~ \$16,-
17 400,000;

18 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

19 “Operation and maintenance, Army”, \$85,000,000;

20 “Operation and maintenance, Air Force”, \$73,000,000;

21 “Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies”,
22 \$32,000,000, *and in addition, \$3,600,000, to be derived by*

1 *transfer from the appropriation "Research, Development,*
 2 *Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies";*

3 "Court of Military Appeals", \$18,000;

4 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

5 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

6 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

7 "Operation and maintenance, general", \$1,731,000, and
 8 in addition, \$1,869,000, to be derived by transfer from the
 9 amount reserved under "Construction general", pursuant to
 10 section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

11 "General expenses", ~~\$1,000,000~~ \$1,100,000, to be de-
 12 rived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Con-
 13 struction, general", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
 14 90-364.

15 UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

16 "Operation and maintenance"; (Release of \$181,000
 17 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
 18 of Public Law 90-364) ;

19 THE PANAMA CANAL

20 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

21 "Operating expenses", \$1,085,000 (and release of
 22 \$120,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
 23 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND

“Limitation on general and administrative expenses”, (increase of \$130,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and release of \$20,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,589,000, to be derived by transfer from “Communicable diseases”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$835,000 reserved under “Salaries and expenses”, Food and Drug Administration pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) :

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

“School assistance in federally affected areas”, \$16,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$12,000 reserved under “School assistance in federally affected areas” pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Salaries and expenses”, \$694,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of

1 \$1,123,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursu-
2 ant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

3 "Civil rights educational activities", \$67,000, to be
4 derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource
5 support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

6 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

7 OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$307,000, to be derived by
9 transfer from "Community mental health resource support",
10 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
11 \$80,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to
12 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

13 HEALTH MANPOWER

14 "Health manpower education and utilization"; (release
15 of \$201,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
16 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

17 "Dental health activities"; (release of \$102,000 re-
18 served under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
19 Public Law 90-364) ;

20 DISEASE PREVENTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

21 "Chronic diseases", \$436,000, to be derived by transfer
22 from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal
23 year 1969: (and release of \$130,000 reserved under
24 "Chronic diseases" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
25 90-364) ;

1 “Air pollution”; (release of \$519,000 reserved under
2 this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
3 90-364) ;

4 “Urban and industrial health”; (Release of \$492,000
5 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
6 Public Law 90-364) ;

7 “Radiological health”, \$407,000, to be derived by trans-
8 fer from “Community mental health resource support”, Pub-
9 lic Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

10 HEALTH SERVICES

11 “Community health services”; (release of \$590,000
12 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201
13 of Public Law 90-364) ;

14 “Patient care and special health services”, \$1,993,000,
15 to be derived by transfer from “Communicable diseases”,
16 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
17 \$91,000 reserved under “Patient care and special health
18 services” pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

19 “Hospital construction activities”; (release of \$169,000
20 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
21 Public Law 90-364) ;

22 “Indian health activities”, \$2,640,000, to be derived
23 by transfer from the amount reserved under “Communicable
24 diseases”, Public Health Service, pursuant to section 201 of

1 ~~Public Law 90-364~~ *fiscal year 1969*: (and release of
2 \$214,000 reserved under "Indian health activities" pursuant
3 to ~~said~~ section 201 of *Public Law 90-364*) ;

4 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

5 "Biologics standards"; (Release of \$114,000 reserved
6 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
7 Law 90-364) ;

8 "Regional medical programs"; (Release of \$67,000
9 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
10 Public Law 90-364) ;

11 "Environmental health sciences"; (Release of \$137,000
12 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
13 Public Law 90-364) ;

14 NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

15 "Mental health research and services", \$401,000, to
16 be derived by transfer from "Community mental health re-
17 source support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969:
18 (and release of \$801,000 reserved under "Mental health
19 research and services" pursuant to section 201 of Public
20 Law 90-364) ;

21 "Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Salaries and expenses",
22 \$1,984,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community
23 mental health resource support", Public Health Service,
24 fiscal year 1969;

OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

“National health statistics”; (Release of \$271,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“National Library of Medicine”; (Release of \$162,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,234,000, to be derived by transfer from “Communicable diseases”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969 ;

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

“Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)”, (Increase of \$18,147,000 in the limitation on “Salaries and expenses”) ;

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

“Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses”, \$56,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969 ;

“Howard University, salaries and expenses”, \$401,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969 ;

“Freedmen’s Hospital, salaries and expenses”, \$291,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental

1 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
2 1969;

3 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$216,000, to be derived by
5 transfer from "Community mental health resource support",
6 Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of
7 \$232,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant
8 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

9 "Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses",
10 \$215,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community
11 mental health resource support", Public Health Service,
12 fiscal year 1969;

13 "Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses"; (Re-
14 lease of \$458,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant
15 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 "Office of Administration, salaries and expenses", \$233,-
17 000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental
18 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
19 1969: (and release of \$10,000 reserved under "Office of
20 Administration, salaries and expenses" pursuant to section
21 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

22 "Surplus property utilization", \$57,000, to be derived
23 by transfer from "Community mental health resource sup-
24 port", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

25 "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses",

1 \$56,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental
2 health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year
3 1969: (and release of \$61,000 reserved under "Office of the
4 General Counsel, salaries and expenses" pursuant to section
5 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

6 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

7 DEVELOPMENT

8 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,407,000; (and release of
10 \$387,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant
11 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$280,000; (and release of
14 \$73,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant
15 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$66,000; and, in addition,
18 \$171,000 (including \$34,000 reserved pursuant to section
19 201 of Public Law 90-364) to be derived by transfer from
20 "Model cities programs"; (and release of \$15,000 reserved
21 on account of "Salaries and expenses", Demonstrations and
22 Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to section 201 of
23 Public Law 90-364) ;

24 "Urban Research and Technology", (Release of \$6,000

1 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to sec-
2 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

3 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

4 "General administration", \$230,000; (and release of
5 \$51,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant
6 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

7 "Regional management and services", \$278,000; (and
8 release of \$80,000 reserved on account of this appropriation
9 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

10 MORTGAGE CREDIT

11 "Limitation on administrative and non-administrative
12 expenses, Federal housing administration"; (Increase of
13 \$465,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and
14 increase of \$1,000,000 in the limitation on non-administra-
15 tive expenses) ;

16 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

17 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

18 "Education and welfare services", \$2,843,000; (and
19 release of \$415,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
20 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

21 "Construction", (Release of \$39,000 reserved under this
22 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
23 90-364) ;

24 "Road construction (liquidation of contract authoriza-

1 tion)”, (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this appropria-
2 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

3 “General administrative expenses”, \$246,000, to be
4 derived by transfer from “Water supply and water pollution
5 control”, fiscal year 1969;

6 “Operation and maintenance, Indian irrigation systems”;
7 (Release of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
8 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

9 “Power systems, Indian irrigation projects”; (Release
10 of \$39,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
11 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 “Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, schools,
13 etc.”; (Release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation
14 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

15 “Tribal funds”; (Release of \$48,000 reserved under this
16 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
17 90-364) ;

18 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

19 “Salaries and expenses”, \$175,000;

20 BUREAU OF MINES

21 “Conservation and development of mineral resources”,
22 \$750,000; and \$433,000, to be derived by transfer from
23 “Solid waste disposal”;

1 “Health and safety”, \$347,000, to be derived by transfer
2 from “Solid waste disposal”;

3 “General administrative expenses”, \$70,000, to be
4 derived by transfer from “Solid waste disposal”;

5 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

6 “Management and investigations of resources”, \$628,-
7 000; (and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropria-
8 tion pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

9 “Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and de-
10 velopment”, \$8,000;

11 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
12 \$7,000;

13 “General administrative expenses”, \$45,000;

14 “Administration of Pribilof Islands”, \$20,000;

15 “Promote and develop fishery products and research
16 pertaining to American fisheries”; (Release of \$10,000
17 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
18 Public Law 90-364) ;

19 “Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan
20 fund”, (Increase of \$13,000 in the limitation on adminis-
21 trative expenses) ;

22 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

23 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
24 \$9,000, which shall be derived by transfer from the amount

1 reserved under "Saline water conversion", fiscal year 1969,
2 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

3 "General administrative expenses", \$78,000; and in
4 addition \$4,000 to be derived by transfer from the amount
5 reserved under "Operation and maintenance", Southwestern
6 Power Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public
7 Law 90-364;

8 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

9 "Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities",
10 \$668,000; (and release of \$115,000 reserved under this ap-
11 propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

12 "General administrative expenses", \$186,000;

13 "Preservation of historic properties", \$21,000;

14 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

15 "General investigations", \$371,000;

16 "Operation and maintenance", \$630,000;

17 "General administrative expenses", \$450,000;

18 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

19 "Construction"; (Release of \$998,000 reserved under
20 this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law
21 90-364) ;

22 "Operation and maintenance"; (Release of \$643,000
23 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of
24 Public Law 90-364) ;

1 “Construction of electric transmission lines and substa-
2 tions, contributions, Bonneville Power Project”; (Release of
3 \$1,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
4 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$298,000;

7 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$454,000;

9 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$31,000;

11 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

12 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

13 “Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service”;

14 (Release of \$88,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
15 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$9,220,000;

18 IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

19 “Salaries and expenses”, \$3,276,000; (and release of
20 \$270,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
21 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

22 LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

23 “Salaries and expenses”; (Release of \$57,000 reserved
24 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
25 Law 90-364) ;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

“Manpower Development and Training Activities”;
(Release of \$92,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses”; (Release of \$313,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses”, \$363,000, of which \$213,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; \$142,000 by transfer from the amount reserved under “Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to said section 201, and \$8,000, by transfer from the amount reserved under “Manpower Development and Training Activities”, pursuant to said section 201; (and release of \$50,000 reserved under “Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to said section 201) ;

“Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses”, (Increase of \$865,000 in the amount available for administrative expenses and release of \$125,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

2 “Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries
3 and expenses”, (Release of \$448,000 reserved under this
4 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
5 364) ;

6 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

7 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$152,000, of which \$100,000
9 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under
10 “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”, pursuant
11 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, and \$52,000 by trans-
12 fer from the amount reserved under “Labor Management
13 Services Administration, salaries and expenses”, pursuant to
14 section 201; (and release of \$120,000 reserved under “Wage
15 and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses”,
16 pursuant to said section 201) ;

17 “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”;
18 (Release of \$992,000 reserved under this appropriation pur-
19 suant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

20 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

21 “Salaries and expenses”, \$180,000, of which \$87,000
22 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under
23 “Office of the Manpower Administrator, salaries and ex-
24 penses”, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;
25 (and release of \$700,000 reserved under “Bureau of Labor

1 Statistics, salaries and expenses", pursuant to said section
2 201) ;

3 BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$14,000, to be derived by
5 transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour
6 Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201
7 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$60,000 reserved
8 under "Bureau of International Labor Affairs, salaries and
9 expenses", pursuant to said section 201) ;

10 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$21,000, to be derived by
12 transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour
13 Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of
14 Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$200,000 reserved
15 under "Office of the Solicitor, salaries and expenses", pur-
16 suant to said section 201) ;

17 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$121,000, to be derived by
19 transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour
20 Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of
21 Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$110,000 reserved
22 under "Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses", pur-
23 suant to said section 201) ;

24 "Federal contract compliance and civil rights program,"
25 \$39,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved

1 under "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses",
2 pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release
3 of \$3,000 reserved under "Federal Contract Compliance
4 and Civil Rights Program", pursuant to said section 201);

5 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

6 (OUT OF POSTAL FUND)

7 "Administration and regional operations"; (Release
8 of \$2,107,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant
9 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

10 "Research, development, and engineering", \$500,000;

11 "Operations", \$195,071,000, and, in addition, \$62,-
12 000,000 to be derived by transfer from "Transportation",
13 fiscal year 1969;

14 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

15 ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$6,787,000, and, in addition,
17 \$750,000 to be derived by transfer from "Chamizal settle-
18 ment", International Boundary and Water Commission,
19 United States and Mexico, and \$83,000 from "Rama Road,
20 Nicaragua";

21 INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

22 "Missions to international organizations", \$153,000;

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:

“Salaries and expenses”, \$43,000;

“Operation and maintenance”, \$29,000;

“American sections, international commissions”, \$19,000;

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

“Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities”, \$425,000;

OTHER

“Migration and refugee assistance”, \$26,000;

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

COAST GUARD

“Operating expenses”, \$9,500,000; (and release of \$82,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Acquisition, construction and improvements”; (Release of \$51,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 “Reserve training”, \$900,000; (and release of \$40,-
2 000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
3 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

4 FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

5 “Operations”, \$30,400,000;

6 “Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports”,
7 \$220,000;

8 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

9 “Highway beautification”, \$64,000;

10 “Motor carrier safety”, \$68,000; (and release of
11 \$22,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
12 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

13 HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

14 “Limitation on general expenses”, (increase of \$875,000
15 in the limitation on administrative expenses; and
16 release of \$641,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant
17 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

18 FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

19 “Salaries and expenses”; (release of \$35,000 reserved
20 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
21 Law 90-364) ;

22 “Bureau of railroad safety”, \$90,000; (and release of
23 \$83,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
24 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$257,000; (and release of \$134,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$2,637,000; (and release of \$1,550,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

BUREAU OF THE MINT

“Salaries and expenses”, \$500,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$425,000; (and release of \$564,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Revenue accounting and processing”, \$4,500,000;

“Compliance”, \$2,800,000; (and release of \$20,360,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

“Salaries and expenses”, \$167,000; (and release of \$85,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,338,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

“Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service”, \$3,-
671,000; (and release of \$677,000 reserved under this ap-
propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Operating expenses, National Archives and Records
Service”, \$300,000; (and release of \$95,000 reserved under
this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
364) ;

“Operating expenses, Transportation and Communica-
tions Service”; (Release of \$5,000 reserved under this ap-
propriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Operating expenses, Property Management and Dis-
posal Service”; (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this
appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
364) ;

“Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator”, \$119,-
000;

“Administrative operations fund”; (Release of \$107,-
000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

“Medical and prosthetic research”, \$1,168,000; (and release of \$362,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

“Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses”, \$589,000;

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$33,000;

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

“Arms control and disarmament activities”, (Release of \$15,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

“Salaries and expenses”, \$500,000;

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,364,000; (and release of \$89,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$370,000;

1 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

2 "Limitation on administrative expenses", (increase of
3 \$97,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

4 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

5 "Salaries and expenses", \$970,000; (and release of
6 \$16,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
7 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

8 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

9 "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
10 penses", (Increase of \$115,000 in the limitation on adminis-
11 trative expenses and release of \$102,000 reserved under this
12 appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-
13 364) ;

14 *"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Sav-*
15 *ings and Loan Insurance Corporation", (Release of \$4,000*
16 *reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201*
17 *of Public Law 90-364) ;*

18 FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$90,000; (and release of
20 \$76,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
21 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

22 FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

23 "Salaries and expenses", \$125,000; (and release of
24 \$8,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
25 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$778,000;

3 FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

4 “Salaries and expenses”, ~~\$32,000~~ \$41,000;

5 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$818,000; (and release of
7 \$382,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
8 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

9 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$30,000; (and release of \$20,-
11 000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section
12 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

13 NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$25,000;

15 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

16 “Salaries and expenses”, ~~\$250,000~~ \$400,000; (and re-
17 lease of \$848,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant
18 to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

19 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

20 “Limitation on salaries and expenses”, (Increase of
21 \$516,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

22 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

23 “Salaries and expenses”, \$140,000;

1 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$594,000; (and release of
3 \$299,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to sec-
4 tion 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

5 SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$200,000; (and release of
7 \$265,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
8 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

9 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$695,000; (and release of
11 \$125,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
12 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

13 “Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art”,
14 \$30,000; (and release of \$23,000 reserved under this appro-
15 priation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

16 TARIFF COMMISSION

17 “Salaries and expenses”, (release of \$53,000 reserved
18 under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public
19 Law 90-364) ;

20 TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

21 “Salaries and expenses”, \$86,000; (and release of
22 \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to
23 section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

1 UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,500,000;

3 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

4 (OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

5 "Parks and recreation", \$322,000;

6 "Health and welfare", \$2,437,000;

7 "Highways and traffic", \$163,000, of which \$140,000
8 shall be payable from the highway fund;9 "Sanitary engineering", \$227,000, of which \$99,000
10 shall be payable from the water fund, \$64,000 from the
11 sanitary sewage works fund, and \$1,000 from the metro-
12 politan area sanitary sewage works fund;13 "Personal services, wage-board employees", \$3,179,-
14 000, of which \$200,300 shall be payable from the highway
15 fund, \$184,000 from the water fund, \$169,000 from the
16 sanitary sewage works fund, and \$2,000 from the metropoli-
17 tan area sanitary sewage works fund.

18 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

19 The sums appropriated in this title for the District of
20 Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for,
21 be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

1 TITLE IV
2 LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET
3 OUTLAYS

4 SEC. 401. ~~(a)~~ Expenditures and net lending ~~(budget~~
5 ~~outlays)~~ of the Federal Government during the fiscal year
6 ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000:
7 *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Con-
8 gress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary pro-
9 posals varies from the President's recommendations thereon,
10 the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the
11 President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of
12 such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and
13 the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly
14 adjusted.

15 ~~(b)~~ The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
16 report periodically to the President and to the Congress on
17 the operation of this section. The first such report shall be
18 made at the end of the first month which begins after the
19 date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be
20 made at the end of each calendar month during the first ses-
21 sion of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each
22 calendar quarter thereafter.

23 SEC. 401. *(a)* Expenditures and net lending *(budget*
24 *outlays)* of the Federal Government during the fiscal year
25 ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$187,900,000,000:

1 *Provided, That such amount shall be increased or decreased*
2 *by the aggregate amount by which the sum of expenditures*
3 *and net lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser*
4 *than the sum of expenditures and net lending in the fiscal*
5 *year ending June 30, 1969, for—*

6 *(1) items designated “Open-ended programs and*
7 *fixed costs” in the table appearing on page 16 of the*
8 *budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970*
9 *(House Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-*
10 *first Congress);*

11 *(2) the item designated “Special Southeast Asia*
12 *support” in the table appearing on page 27 of that budget;*
13 *and*

14 *(3) programs of aid to schools in federally impacted*
15 *areas, under the Acts of September 23 and September*
16 *30, 1950 (20 U.S.C., chs. 13 and 19).*

17 *(b) The President shall reserve from expenditure and*
18 *net lending, from appropriations or other obligational au-*
19 *thority heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available (in-*
20 *cluding amounts made available to carry out programs to*
21 *which title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education*
22 *Amendments is applicable), such amounts as may be neces-*
23 *sary to effectuate the provisions of subsection (a).*

24 *Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts*
25 *sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1,900,000,000*

1 in expenditures and net lending, below the amounts recom-
2 mended in the April review of the 1970 Budget, for programs
3 other than those designated in subparagraphs (1), (2), and
4 (3) of subsection (a).

5 (c) In the administration of any program as to which—

6 (1) the amount of expenditures or net lending is
7 limited pursuant to subsection (a), and

8 (2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other
9 distribution of funds among recipients is required to be
10 determined by application of a formula involving the
11 amount appropriated or otherwise made available for
12 distribution, the amount available for expenditure or
13 obligation (as determined by the President) shall be
14 substituted, in the application of the formula, for the
15 amount appropriated or otherwise made available.

16 TITLE V

17 GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in
19 this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the
20 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

21 SEC. 502. Except where specifically increased or de-
22 creased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained
23 within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations
24 or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1969, limiting
25 the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or

1 for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which
2 may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations
3 available for or involving such services, are hereby increased
4 to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized
5 by or pursuant to law.

6 *SEC. 503. Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure*
7 *Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-364, approved*
8 *June 28, 1968), is hereby repealed.*

9 *SEC. 504. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made*
10 *available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1969, shall remain*
11 *available for obligation until July 1, 1969, or for five days*
12 *after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later,*
13 *unless a longer period is specifically provided: Provided,*
14 *That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appro-*
15 *priations and authority for the fiscal year 1969 as well as*
16 *those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified*
17 *and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof.*

Passed the House of Representatives May 21, 1969.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

[Report No. 91-228]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for
other purposes.

MAY 23, 1969

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

JUNE 11, 1969

Reported with amendments

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 13, 1969
For actions of June 12, 1969
91st-1st; No. 97

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	7,27	Holidays.....	58	Potatoes.....	1
Aging.....	21	Honey.....	66	Poverty.....	38,51,62
Appalachia.....	36	Housing.....	47	Property.....	23
Appropriations.....	8	Human nutrition.....	40	Purchasing.....	39
Buildings.....	53	Hunger.....	18	Reclamation.....	60
Claims.....	67	Indians.....	73	Records.....	65
Conservation.....	11	Information.....	32	Recreation.....	16,23,33,55
Consumer credit.....	24	Interest rates.....	4,14,50	Regional development....	36
Contract claims.....	30	Labeling.....	9	Research.....	28,48
Dairy.....	29	Lamb imports.....	10	Retirement.....	54
Economic priorities..	18,20	Lands.....	3	Rural America.....	11,14,19
Education.....	25,31	Legislative program....	6	Solid waste disposal....	69
Environment.....	35,69	Libraries.....	37,44	Subsidy payments.....	42
Expenditures.....	18	Marine resources.....	70	Supplemental	
Farm training.....	12	Marketing orders.....	2	appropriations.....	8
Federal-State relations.	45	Meat imports.....	10,72	Taxation.....	5,14
Fisheries.....	71	Meat inspection.....	26	Textile imports.....	10
Food stamps.....	63	Mink imports.....	10	Timber yield.....	43
Foreign aid.....	49,59	Monopolies.....	15	Tobacco.....	13
Foreign trade.....	10,52,72	Opinion poll.....	46	Veterans' benefits....	12,61
Forestry.....	26	Organization.....	56	Wage board.....	64
Golden eagle.....	57	Pay system.....	54	Water.....	68
Grazing fees.....	41	Pears.....	2	Welfare.....	51
Health.....	17	Personnel.....	34,54,64	Wildlife.....	16
Health insurance.....	34,54	Pesticides.....	22		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported second supplemental appropriation bill. House committee reported bill to provide marketing orders for certain pears, and potato promotion bill. Sen. Aiken et al introduced and Sen. Aiken discussed food stamp bill. Sen. Muskie et al introduced and Sen. Muskie discussed environmental improvement quality bill. Sen. Brooke introduced and discussed trade expansion bill. Sen. Hruska introduced and discussed meat quota-control bill.

HOUSE

1. POTATO PROMOTION. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2777, the potato research and promotion bill (H. Rept. 91-312). p. H4788
2. PEARS; MARKETING ORDERS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 2690, to provide marketing orders for pears for canning and freezing (H. Rept. 91-310). p. H4788
3. LANDS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 9946, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quit-claim retained rights in certain tracts of land in Lee County, S. C. (H. Rept. 91-312). p. H4788
4. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Montgomery deplored the "most recent increase in the prime interest rate." p. H4762
5. TAXATION. Rep. Anderson, Ill., commended Members of both Houses who were called to the White House to consider the question of an extension of the 10-percent surtax for their pledge to use their influence to secure a favorable vote on the President's tax proposal. p. H4764
6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the following program for next week. Monday is Consent Calendar Day, and the Older Americans Act amendments and the Padre Island National Seashore, Tex., bill will be brought up under suspension of the rules. Tuesday is Private Calendar Day and will be followed by the public health cigarette smoking bill and the bill for the construction of the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Washington. p. H4760
7. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 16. p. H4788

SENATE

8. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. H. R. 11400, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1969 which had been reported earlier by the Appropriations Committee with amendments (S. Rept. 91-228), was made the unfinished business for debate Mon.. pp. S6215, S6411
9. LABELING. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1689, to require labeling of hazardous toys and other such articles intended for use by children. p. D495
10. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Moss supported an amendment to limit lamb imports and inserted supporting press releases detailing the statements of officials of the domestic sheep industry. pp. S6220-2

For Leon was the complete professional man, thoroughly grounded in the disciplines of economics, Soviet affairs, and international relations; and he was gifted with a power of insight, analysis and articulation that enabled him to make a profound impact not only within the narrower sphere of Government service but far beyond in the many worlds of scholarship, education, and business.

Leon's professional activities as a specialist in Soviet economics and a long-time student of international trade and world affairs are recorded in a vast bibliography of published and unpublished writings, compiled during years of public service in the Department of Commerce and the Library of Congress. They are recorded, too, in an impressive record of active participation, often as one of the principal generating forces, in professional organizations whose purposes were to advance the study of Soviet affairs and the study of economics. And, they are recorded in his commitment to teaching in the School of International Service at American University and in the ever-lengthening list of lectures and panel participation in meetings of specialized groups too numerous to mention.

As a truly professional man, Leon moved with an uncommon grace and ease within the Government service and between it and the worlds of scholarship and business; and wherever he went, those with whom he was closely associated could not fail to feel the impress of the power of his intellect, the depth and breadth of his wisdom, and the vast dimension of his human understanding.

In this way Leon epitomized the finest of what the intellectual should be in the Government service. He should be, as Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. once said during the Kennedy years, a conduit between the intellectual world outside and the Government, a sort of vital connection for tapping an essential, life-sustaining natural resource.

This Leon was; but he was more: by his own unique professional abilities and personal qualities, his presence not only enriched the Government service, but, in a reverse way, enriched also the scholarly world; for more than just acting as a conduit of ideas flowing into the Government, Leon himself was a seminal source of influence, generating ideas throughout the nation's scholarly community itself.

Of all the publications in both private journals and public documents for which Leon bore either direct or indirect responsibility, perhaps none illustrates this point better than the studies prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress under Leon's direction. First published in 1962 and followed by numerous succeeding volumes, these studies have drawn widely upon the expertise of specialists in the Soviet economy within the Government and within the nation's scholarly community.

Besides assuming the directorial and editorial responsibilities, Leon also contributed chapters on Soviet trade.

Recognized immediately as work of extraordinary merit, these studies have become a standard source for the study of the Soviet economy in our nation's colleges and universities and in other centers of Soviet studies throughout the West.

Thus, in this case alone (for there are many more) Leon was able to exert his energies and apply his extraordinary gifts not only for the benefit of Congress but for the good of scholars everywhere and for the advancement of knowledge.

But this is what Leon was: A person imbued with the finest spirit of intellectualism, and dedicated to the service of others. For Leon's was a life devoted to the achievement of these greatest of all human values.

Intellectually, he was a totally committed person. His interests ranged far beyond his professional concerns, to the theater, to literature, to history; indeed, he was the uni-

versal man who found infinite pleasure in contemplating and discussing the whole of the human experience. A chance telephone conversation, a casual "walk around the bloc" after a noon-day lunch, table-talk at dinner before a meeting of the local AAASS chapter—these could be, and more often were, occasions for a stirring intellectual engagement on the politics of the day, the social unrest in the country, the state of the theater and the arts, or an analysis of the latest developments in East-West relations.

But Leon's intellectualism was not something self-centered and self-contained: it was always placed in the service of others. This was probably his most distinguishing personal characteristic; for, as a totally involved human being, he willingly and unsparingly shared with others himself, his energy, his many gifts and talents.

In this sense Leon was a genuine humanist. As a compassionate man, he loved humanity for its better qualities; and despite the cruelties that he had seen in his own lifetime, he could not take a tragic view of life or of history. For him, the history of modern man represented the accumulated values of all civilization, and civilization for all its faults and frailties was moving to a higher plane of social betterment for all mankind.

An optimist, he was, ever hopeful, ever expecting better things, although by no means was he unmindful of the odds that mankind faced. An essentially untragic man living in a potentially tragic world, he could look beyond the overt weaknesses and shortcomings of our country, and see its many strengths, and assessing its possibilities for achieving a greater good in this world, could cast his vision to more distant horizons and give hope and confidence, indeed faith, to those more pessimistic.

This was Leon; and one should not have expected less of so fine and sensitive a man; for, as we all know, he was the kindest of men who had a nobility of spirit that touched us all.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS 1969—PROGRAM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is not possible to have disposition of S. 1708 today, and probably not in the very near future.

In accordance with the previously announced schedule of business by the leadership, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 218, H.R. 11400, the Supplemental Appropriations Act. No action will be taken on this measure until Monday next. I wish to emphasize the previously announced schedule that Senate Resolution 85, the so-called commitments' resolution, will be the next order of business in the Senate, immediately after disposition of the supplemental appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I want to thank the acting majority leader for this action. I think it is wise. I

understand it has been taken with the full concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), who is the author of the bill. I hope that before the bill again comes before the Senate Senators will have an opportunity to consider it and will have an opportunity to consider the objections which Senator Wayne Morse made to it. He was the author of the Morse formula. He sent me a letter, which I read into the RECORD a few minutes ago. I hope Senators will consider carefully what S. 1708 would do as a giveaway, and the bad precedent which it would set.

THE MILITARY BUDGET AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, on Tuesday, June 10, 1969, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) presented testimony to the Subcommittee on Economy in Government, which is holding hearings on "The Military Budget and National Economic Priorities."

Senator GOLDWATER made an excellent presentation of an important viewpoint with regard to military spending. Although I do not entirely agree with all aspects of this viewpoint, there are a number of areas of common agreement between Senator GOLDWATER and myself.

Both of us, I believe, are concerned about waste and inefficiency in the Defense Department. Both of us support a strong defense program.

I agree with Senator GOLDWATER that "the American people have had enough of secrecy and distortion from the Pentagon." I agree that the American people have had enough of "false information about low bids, efficiency performances, procurement practices."

I also agree with Senator GOLDWATER that "the American people have had enough from the Pentagon that sounds like cost-effectiveness and which was really waste and inefficiency."

The subcommittee was particularly pleased that Senator GOLDWATER could participate in the present inquiry because of his extensive knowledge and experience with military spending problems as a result of his membership on the Senate Armed Services Committee over the past many years.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have printed in the RECORD the full text of Senator GOLDWATER's statement to the Subcommittee on Economy in Government, Joint Economic Committee, June 10, 1969.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I wish to thank you for inviting me here today to testify on this very important question of the military budget and national economic priorities. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that my career and my public statements over the years have qualified me to some extent to add my voice to any discussion which has to do with military expenditures in today's world.

Now, when I was first asked to testify at these hearings, I declined. My feeling was that the members of this subcommittee may already have made up their minds as to where the military budget should fit in any

overall consideration of national spending priorities. In addition to that, I was concerned that the subcommittee's revelations on waste and inefficiency in defense procurement would become a controlling factor in any recommendations it might make on spending priorities.

This feeling, I must say, stemmed primarily from the news release which was attached to the Chairman's letter to me in which it was announced that there are clear signs that the Federal Government is spending too much money on military programs. This was a direct quote from that press release which went on to say that the hearings of this subcommittee on the C-5A cargo plane illustrated that the Pentagon was unable to effectively control the cost of its weapon system.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the whole idea of coming to grips with waste and inefficiency and the expenditure of too much money in defense procurement. However, I do not believe that this should be a ruling factor in any decision on spending priorities.

As I say, this was my feeling. I must say that it hasn't been entirely dispelled. However, since declining the committee's first invitation to appear and testify, I have had several conversations with Chairman Proxmire which clarified certain points in my mind. In addition to that, President Nixon has subsequently clarified the administration's viewpoints on some of these questions.

Consequently, I am here today in the hope that I may be of some assistance in these deliberations.

At the outset, let me make it very clear that I did not come here today to debate military strategy or to criticize or evaluate American policy in Vietnam or other areas of the world. Nor did I come here to suggest any panaceas for the situations that confront us.

For example, I am not about to come up with any easy-sounding solution such as the nationalization of defense industries doing more than 75 per cent of their total business with the government. I have no desire, believe me, to extend the bureaucratic arm of this government, especially into the field of private enterprise. I ask you to consider how long it might take us to receive delivery on a new plane if Lockheed or North American Aviation or Boeing or any of the other defense contractors were being operated with that marvelous bureaucratic efficiency with which our Post Office is run.

In the Chairman's invitation for me to appear, he spoke of a dialogue on the important questions involved in the military budget and national economic priorities. I sincerely hope that such a dialogue will be possible, but I must, in truth, say that so far from what I have read in the papers, these hearings have seemed to be more of a sounding board for those who want to criticize various facets of our military establishment or our foreign policy than it has a serious dialogue on where the defense of this nation should stand in any list of priorities.

For example, everytime that Secretary Laird tries to explain the necessity of a system like the ABM, the hue and cry immediately is raised that he is attempting to frighten the American people.

Mr. Chairman, in stating the problems that face this nation on a worldwide basis from a militant, aggressive Communist nation like Soviet Russia, I do not believe the Secretary is engaging in a deliberate effort to frighten the American people. If the truth is frightening, so help me that's the way it's going to have to be. Because the American people have had enough of secrecy and distortion from the Pentagon, whether they be called justifiable lying in the name of national security, such as we used to hear from gentlemen like Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester or whether they are in the form of

false information about low bids, efficiency performances, procurement practices, the American people have had enough from the Pentagon that sounds like cost-effectiveness and which was really waste and inefficiency.

I am convinced that the American people want the truth about their government and about the challenges which face us as a nation. If the truth is frightening, if it gives us cause for concern, I am convinced that the American people will be able to cope. I don't want anyone in this administration, particularly in the Defense Department, glossing over the true situation that confronts the American taxpayers and their collective security.

We are faced with a challenge, and let me say that it is not Secretary Laird nor President Nixon who is arranging the formidable military buildup in the Soviet Union. Nor do we know the facts of this buildup from their information alone. Many independent sources, including the British Institute for Strategic Studies have also laid out the cold, hard facts of a Soviet armaments buildup.

The plain fact is the Soviet Union is building up all facets of its military capacity. Its nuclear capabilities are being extended. Its navy is being enlarged. All of its conventional arms are on the increase. The SS-9 missile is on an increased production schedule. They are spending a growing portion of their national income on military hardware.

These items are not related as a scare tactic; they are reported because they are facts. And I believe this nation and this subcommittee have got to face these facts and the overall fact of a worldwide challenge to the United States in deciding about the disposition of military expenditures.

I do not mean by this that there should be any condoning of or acquiescing in waste and inefficiency and extravagance in the military establishment. I believe that we must do everything in our power to eliminate waste and inefficiency and extravagance in the Pentagon and in all other departments of this sprawling, hard-to-manage federal system.

And I should like to emphasize that President Nixon shares this view. In fact, in his speech at the U.S. Air Force Academy, he urged the graduates to be "in the vanguard of the movement" to eliminate waste and inefficiency and demand clear answers on procurement policy.

Your own subcommittee, in its previous report, has outlined this problem in great and admirable detail. The Defense Department over the past eight years has loaded the taxpayers of this country with billions of dollars that were unnecessarily spent. I want to congratulate this subcommittee on its work in bringing the full magnitude of this situation to public attention.

I do believe, however, that when this subcommittee and this Congress begin to investigate and report on billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money lost, they are, to some degree reporting on their own delinquency.

I think we have to remember that no one forced the Congress to approve these funds. These huge defense budgets over the past eight years were subject to Congressional inquiry. Nobody actually jammed them down our throats.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not been here for the last four years, but I have a pretty fair idea of what went on in the matter of defense expenditures prior to that time. And I want to say that it was no mystery to well informed and inquiring people that things were terribly wrong at the Pentagon and in its procurement procedures.

As a matter of fact, the TFX fighter bomber case alone was sufficient to point us in that direction. I say again, there was no mystery. Many stories were written about the investigative efforts of Senators McClellan, Jackson, Curtis, and Mundt, directed at cutting away some of the confusion and some

of the misinformation that was being used to cover up a very, very bad piece of procurement by the Pentagon.

Now this was a big case. It involved billions of dollars. And it was a case where a multi-billion dollar contract was awarded to the highest bidder for a plane over the advice of practically every expert in the military services affected.

As I say, there was no mystery about all this. Books were written on the subject. I have read a book called "The Pentagon" written by Washington correspondent Clark Mollenhoff in 1967 and another volume by the same author called "The Despoilers of Democracy." Both of these books told a frightening story of waste and inefficiency, extravagance and favoritism in the Department of Defense.

Now these were not generalities. Mr. Mollenhoff and reporters like him dealt with specific facts about the waste and inefficiency and squandering of the taxpayers' money in the Department of Defense. But I don't recall any great hue and cry being raised at that time. I don't recall any outpouring of criticism aimed at the so-called military-industrial complex. I don't recall any efforts to take a more than customary look at every facet of the defense budget. I don't recall either any strenuous attempt by any group in Congress to establish a system of priorities for this nation's critical needs.

Perhaps we failed in this respect because of the public relations ability of former Defense Secretary Robert McNamara.

As the *Washington Post*, in an article by Richard Hardwood and Laurence Stern, observed on June 4.

"McNamara became a liberal hero despite the Bay of Pigs, the Dominican intervention and the war in Vietnam and despite the steadily rising costs of the military establishment (from \$47 billion in 1961 to more than \$80 billion today)."

I believe we must remember that it was McNamara, and not Laird, who presided over the Defense Department when all the waste and inefficiency and cost overruns were being piled up. He is the man I suspect who should have been called as a witness in your prior hearings on waste and inefficiency in defense procurement. And I believe he ought to be heard in these current hearings. The Congress certainly ought to know what the man who decided the destinies of this huge undertaking for so long a period of time has to say about the mess that the incoming administration found when it took over the Pentagon.

So much for past history. Now I believe it is time for this committee to direct its attention to how best it can come to grips with the current problem.

Let me be very clear. I am interested in your deliberations and I am very desirous that some recommendation will come forth which will take into account not only the huge burden which our present defense needs place on the American taxpayers, but also will take into account the continued security of the American people and the continued welfare of the free world. I am as much concerned as you are over the high cost of defense. It worries me greatly, but at the same time I recognize that the kind of emphasis which currently is being placed on this problem could result in a dangerous lowering of our overall needed defense outlays.

I want you gentlemen to know that I firmly believe in a system of priorities for the spending of federal money. I have long advocated this and believe it should be as important a part of the process of spending in government as it is in the operation of a business or spending in our private lives. I believe such a system of priorities should not be confined to broad subjects such as welfare, housing, urban problems and military spending and decisions as to which should

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 17, 1969
For actions of June 16, 1969
91st 1st No. 98

CONTENTS

Appalachia.....	3	Grape boycott.....	31	Pollution.....	28, 38
Atomic energy.....	16	Health.....	7	Recreation.....	13
Chemical warfare.....	35	Hunger.....	8	Research.....	25, 42
Contracts.....	22, 44	Interest rates.....	6, 17, 30	Rural America.....	29
Education.....	23	Lands.....	15, 41	Rural fires.....	4
Environment.....	9, 28, 35, 38	Legislative program.....	12	Shoe imports.....	18
Expositions.....	2	Livestock.....	40	Small Business Act.....	44
Farm centers.....	29	Marketing.....	39, 40	Sugar loans.....	32
Farm loans.....	24	Monopolies.....	11	Supplemental	
Farm payments.....	20, 27	Older Americans.....	14	appropriations.....	1
Fisheries.....	5	Opinion polls.....	34	Tax reform.....	21, 16, 36
Food processing.....	33	Packers and Stockyards.....	40	Tobacco.....	7, 19
Foreign trade.....	10, 18, 43	Pesticides.....	35	Water.....	37

HIGHLIGHTS:

Senate debated second supplemental appropriation bill.

SENATE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. Began debate on H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969 (pp. S6483-96, S6503-8).

"The bill is divided into five titles. Title I is confined to Southeast Asia operations. Title II deals with programs, and also with pay costs associated with those programs. Title III deals with pay costs entirely. Title IV involves an amendment dealing with expenditure limitations. Title V contains general provisions normal to appropriation bills and also includes a provision repealing section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of last year, 90-364" (S6483).

Sen. Byrd, W. Va., said that among those emergency items submitted to the Senate committee and not considered by the House, amounting to \$450 million, are \$29 million in flood prevention and control, \$160 million for the International Development Association; \$180 million for veterans compensation, pensions, and medical care, and \$45 million for Atomic Energy Commission fire damage (p. S6483).

2. EXPOSITIONS. The Foreign Relations Committee reported without amendment, S. 856, to provide for Federal Government recognition of and participation in international expositions proposed to be held in the United States (S. Rept. 91-234). p. S6457

a subcommittee of

3. APPALACHIA. The "Daily Digest" states that the Public Works Committee approved for full committee consideration S. 1072, proposed Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1969. "As approved by the subcommittee the bill would provide: (1) \$294 million for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for Appalachian regional development highway system, (2) \$285 million for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for extension of authority of the five regional commissions, \$100 million of which would be for regional development highway system, and (3) extend for 1 year title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act providing public works grants through the Economic Development Administration." p. D502

4. RURAL FIRES. Received from the Alaska Legislature a resolution urging the passage of a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with and furnish assistance to states, local governments and others in establishing a system for prevention and control of fires in rural areas. p. S6455

5. FISHERIES. Received from the Alaska Legislature a resolution urging the Congress to formulate a national fisheries policy and establish a cabinet level office to administer it. p. S6455

6. INTEREST RATES. Sen. Randolph urged the President to "let it be known that he will use powers at his disposal to roll back the interest rate increase." pp. S6460-1

7. TOBACCO; HEALTH. Sen. Baker inserted Sen. Cook's address on the question of regulation of the tobacco industry and its advertising. pp. S6464-5

Sen. Moss inserted an article, "Smoking and Health: Closing the Ring on the Cigarette." pp. S6462-4

by the plenary session of the General Assembly on December 11, 1946.

This resolution declared that genocide, the "denial of the right of existence of entire human groups," "shocks the conscience of mankind, results in great losses to humanity in the form of cultural and other contributions represented by these human groups, and is contrary to moral law and to the spirit and aims of the United Nations." President Truman in a letter transmitting this Convention to the Senate of the United States June 16, 1949, emphasized "that America has long been a symbol of freedom and democratic progress to peoples less favored than we have been and that we must maintain their belief in us by our policies and our acts."

For 20 years this Convention has languished in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Unfortunately, there have been no encouraging signs that the committee will consider this Convention in the near future. By the leading part the United States has taken in the United Nations in producing an effective international legal instrument outlawing the world-shocking crime of genocide, we have established before the world our firm and clear policy against that crime. By giving its advice and consent to ratification of the Genocide Convention, the Senate will demonstrate that the United States is prepared to take effective action on its part to contribute to the establishment of principles of law and justice.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 11400, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, first I should like to present a broad picture of the second supplemental appropriation bill. The total bill as reported by the Senate committee provides \$4,456,809,644. This amount is \$673,596,878 over the House appropriation of \$3,783,212,766. It is \$357,495,690 under the budget estimate of \$4,814,305,334, submitted to the Senate.

The budget estimate as considered by the Senate committee amounting to \$4,814 million is \$450,298,378 over the revised budget estimate submitted to the House of Representatives amounting to \$4,364,006,956.

Among those emergency items submitted to the Senate committee and not considered by the House, amounting to \$450 million, are \$29 million in flood prevention and control, \$160 million for the International Development Association; \$180 million for veterans compensation, pensions, and medical care, and \$45 million for Atomic Energy Commission fire damage.

I believe it will be of interest to the Senate to know that included in this bill is \$1,686,000,000 for increased pay costs, of which \$1,492,000,000 is in additional budget authority, the remaining portion to be derived from transfers from reserves and so on.

Included in the bill is \$2,534,000,000 for the Department of Defense. This is \$222,000,000 over the appropriation allowed by the House, and it is \$337,000,000 under the budget estimate submitted to the Senate, which amounted to \$2,871,000,000.

Mr. President, included in these DOD figures are added costs for personnel benefits for Army and Air National Guard technicians, who were granted Federal employee status; operational support for 1,800 sorties per month for B-52's; funds for military and civilian personnel pay increases that became effective last July 1; funds for additional retirement pay costs resulting from the cost-of-living increases that became effective on April 1, 1968, and February 1, 1969; extra funds for pay and allowances of 53,000 additional personnel deployed to Southeast Asia as a result of the Communist Tet offensive a year ago last January; funds for ammunition, aircraft fuel, hostile fire pay, and combat rations for the increase in deployed personnel.

It was necessary, following the seizure of the *Pueblo* and the Tet offensive in January of last year, to deploy an additional 53,000 personnel to Southeast Asia; so a good bit of the money for the Department of Defense included in this bill is to defray those unanticipated expenses.

Also included are moneys to fund the increase of 43,188 in the average strength of the Armed Forces to the current level of 3,471,095 men.

The total estimates for Southeast Asia operations amounted to \$1,496 million. The Senate committee has allowed \$1,272 million in direct appropriations and \$8,910,000 in transfers from reserves and so on, making a total of \$1,280,910,000 for Southeast Asia operations. Included in this amount is \$420 million for ammunition and \$308 million for the modernization of the Armed Forces of South Vietnam; \$298 million of this modernization money will be for phase 1, and \$9.7 million will be for phase 2.

It might be of interest to Senators to know that in addition to the \$308 million in this bill for the modernization of South Vietnamese forces, there is \$132 million in the regular fiscal year 1969 DOD appropriation bill, and \$86 million will be made available through repro-

graming, making a total of \$526 million for the modernization of the forces of South Vietnam in fiscal year 1969, of which \$490 million would be for phase 1 and \$36 million would be for phase 2; and there is \$652 million in the regular 1970 appropriation request for the modernization of South Vietnam forces.

Mr. President, the bill is divided into five titles. Title I is confined to Southeast Asia operations. Title II deals with programs, and also with pay costs associated with those programs. Title III deals with pay costs entirely. Title IV involves an amendment dealing with expenditure limitations. Title V contains general provisions normal to appropriation bills and also includes a provision repealing section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of last year, 90-364.

Now I should like to proceed to a summary review of the various titles in the bill.

TITLE I

Title I relates solely to military operations in Southeast Asia. The committee recommends new budget authority, as I said a moment ago, in the sum of \$1,272,000,000 and the transfer of \$8,910,000 to provide a total of \$1,280,910,000 for this purpose. The recommended appropriations and transfer authority represent an increase of \$46,910,000 over the House allowance and a reduction of \$215,990,000 in the revised estimates. As Senators will note, the line items in this title of the bill are explained in detail in the report, commencing at page 8, and I will not attempt to particularize in this statement. I do emphasize, however, that the funds herein provided do not in any way constitute a basis for either an escalation or a deescalation of combat operations in South Vietnam.

TITLE II

Title II encompasses program items for many of the departments of the Government, as well as increased pay costs associated with the particular line item. In this title, the committee recommends appropriations in the amount of \$1,816,672,088, an increase of \$450,757,776 over the House bill and a reduction of \$35,998,850 in the budget estimates.

For chapter I, Department of Agriculture, a total of \$13,118,000 is recommended, the full amount requested by the Department. Four million dollars of this sum was requested in a document transmitted to the Senate—and not considered by the House—for flood prevention under the Soil Conservation Service, to meet emergency conservation costs in California and Nevada, under section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950. These funds are urgently needed for the installation of emergency measures in California such as channel clearing and debris removal, repairing of dams and streambank stabilization, reseeding and other practices to prevent further erosion and landslides—made necessary by the damaging floods which occurred in January of this year. Also, reseeding and terracing work is required in Ash Canyon in Nevada.

Attention is called to the committee's action with respect to the emergency credit revolving fund, Farmers Home Administration—page 12 of the report. The committee has concurred in the language

inserted by the House authorizing the temporary transfer of \$25 million of unobligated funds from the direct loan account, to be repaid from future repayments to the emergency credit revolving funds. Although no estimate was received to effect this transfer, the language included in the bill will accomplish a similar objective contained in Senate Joint Resolution 111, authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to advance up to \$25 million to the revolving fund. The Department has stated that in view of the language in this present supplemental bill, separate legislation would not now be required.

For the Department of Defense items in this title, the committee recommends \$227,950,000 in new budget authority, an increase of \$1,900,000 over the House allowance, but \$21,732,000 under the amount requested. These items are set forth on pages 13 to 15, and I believe are fully explained therein.

Chapter III contains items for the District of Columbia. In Federal funds, the committee recommends \$29,101,000, which is an increase of \$18,736,000 over the House allowance. The committee has concurred in the House allowance of \$10,365,000 for the increased Federal payment, thus providing a total Federal payment of \$89,365,000 of the \$90 million authorized for fiscal year 1969. The committee has, in addition, considered and recommended the sum of \$18,736,000 for the initial construction funding of the rapid rail transit system.

The recommendations providing for appropriations for the operation of the District government from District of Columbia funds are self-explanatory. I would call attention, however, to the funds provided to improve the city's correctional system—funds for overtime and unabsorbable losses in connection with disturbances at correctional institution; initiation of four centers for the work release program; continuation of inservice training for correctional officers; 7 new personnel at the District of Columbia jail and the Women's Detention Center; and improved health services, including funds for nine new medical/dental positions.

Under chapter IV, foreign operations, the major item is the \$160 million recommended by the committee for the subscription to the International Development Association. Parenthetically, I wish to state that I voted against this appropriation in the subcommittee. This sum represents the first installment of the second replenishment of the resources of the International Development Association, authorized in Public Law 91-14, approved May 23, 1969. This legislation, which I voted against, authorizes United States participation in the resources of IDA to the extent of an additional \$480 million in three equal installments of \$160 million. The initial participation of the United States in this institution was \$320,290,000, paid in five installments with an average of \$64 million annually during fiscal years 1961-1965. The U.S. share in the first replenishment was \$312 million, payable in three equal installments of \$104 million during fiscal years 1966, 1967, and 1968.

For chapter V, Independent Offices and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the committee recommends \$7,168,000 for fiscal year 1968 and \$488,116,000 for fiscal year 1969—for a total allowance of \$495,284,000, which is \$182,054,000 over the House-passed bill, but \$6,386,000 under the supplemental requests. I will not take the time of Senators to refer to each of the items in this chapter—which is printed at page 20 of the report—but will call attention to the following:

For disaster relief, the committee recommends the \$35 million requested, to provide relief for areas devastated by natural disasters occurring earlier in this calendar year.

For the Federal Trade Commission, the committee concurs in the House allowance of \$600,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission. Of this amount, \$100,000 is provided for the employment of 23 new personnel to carry out the Commission's responsibilities under a new program to evaluate the advertising of certain drugs, along with appropriate language in the bill making the funds available until September 30, 1969.

The Veterans' Administration portion of this chapter contains several large items which I believe should be mentioned in this summary.

For compensation and pensions, \$276,600,000 is recommended, which includes the House allowance of \$179 million and an additional \$97,600,000, which was a later budget submission to the Senate. These funds are required for the payment of benefits as a result of newly enacted legislation and anticipated caseload increases.

The committee recommends the full supplemental request of \$89,200,000 for readjustment benefits. This \$75 million increase over the House allowance was requested in a supplemental document submitted to the Senate and was not considered by the House of Representatives. These additional funds are required for the payment of educational benefits and are not administratively controllable. As indicated in the report, the average training load and the average unit cost are higher than anticipated.

For the appropriation, medical care, the committee recommends \$53,800,000 in new budget authority and \$15,167,800 in release of reserves. Of the new budget authority allowed, \$7,611,000 covers mandatory wage board pay increases not considered by the House.

With respect to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the committee has recommended the restoration of \$10 million in contract authority, to provide the full amount of the \$50 million requested, for the homeownership assistance program under section 235 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, as well as \$10 million additional in contract authority over the House allowance for rental housing assistance under section 236 of the act.

Supplemental appropriations for the Department of the Interior are contained in chapter VI of title II and are itemized, beginning on page 24 of the committee report.

In this chapter, attention is called to the items under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. For education and welfare services, the committee recommends \$2,781,000. The supplemental estimate, which was submitted to the Senate and was not, therefore, considered in the House, alerted the committee to the fact that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had overspent its appropriations for welfare and guidance services. While funds in the amount of \$2,781,000 are herewith provided, the committee has indicated its disapproval of this practice and has directed that safeguards be established to prevent similar occurrences in the future.

Within the \$2,700,000 recommended for resources management, the committee has allowed \$150,000 to provide an additional 76 million board-feet of lumber to help relieve the timber shortage in the United States. This sum is made available until September 30, 1969. With the allowance, however, the committee has directed that the amount be so utilized that none of it contribute in any way to the harvest of logs or timber for export from the United States, with the further provision that none of any other appropriated funds may be substituted for this appropriation so as to permit timber harvest for export.

For the Bureau of Mines, \$750,000 has been added for improvement of the Federal health and safety program for coal mines. These funds will accelerate the hiring and training of coal and metal mine inspectors, and will provide research on dust production and control. Also, \$300,000 has been added for expenses in connection with preliminary work necessary for the establishment of an educational institute to provide professional training in health and safety.

For the Forest Service, the committee has provided \$26,062,000 for forest protection and utilization, which is \$654,000 below the supplemental estimate and the House allowance. Of this amount, \$24,374,000 is recommended for forest land management, \$1,564,000 for forest research, and \$124,000 for State and private forestry cooperation. Included in this appropriation are funds for the additional sale preparation of 270 million board-feet of lumber from national forest lands as part of the program to relieve the current timber shortage in the United States. By inclusion of appropriate language in the bill, \$460,000 is to remain available for this purpose until September 30, 1969.

Chapter VII contains supplemental funds for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. I call attention to page 31 of the report and the item, Higher Educational Activities of the Office of Education. The committee recommendation of \$19,920,000 is \$8,759,000 over the House allowance and the amount requested. The committee has disallowed \$7,241,000 authorized as payment to the Federal City College in the District of Columbia in lieu of a Federal land-grant available to colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. This designation was bestowed upon the Federal City College in the authorizing legislation. In the opinion of the committee, the school is not a college of agriculture

and mechanic arts—particularly a college of agriculture—and it is the committee's view that further consideration should be given to the matter before the hasty appropriation of funds on the basis of such a qualification. The \$3,920,000 approved is for interest subsidization grants to facilitate borrowing for construction from non-Federal sources by higher educational institutions. This sum would provide for interest payments for 1 year on loans totaling \$145 million. The committee cautions against the possibility of exorbitant interest rates being charged the borrowing institution and subsequently passed on to the Government, which is not inconceivable since the enabling legislation authorizes the Secretary to pay interest in excess of 3 percent, with no upper limit. The Secretary of the Department and the Commissioner of Education are expected to take necessary steps to see that interest rates do not exceed prevailing general interest rates charged for comparable loans and risks. The committee has restored \$16,000,000 for educational opportunity grants.

The committee has denied the \$15 million requested for a new appropriation account, District of Columbia medical facilities, which were requested in. Although these funds were requested in the 1970 budget, the House Committee on Appropriations included the item in this supplemental appropriation bill. The Senate committee is of the view that no special grants or preferential treatment should be given to any of the States or the District of Columbia since all States and the District are entitled to grants for hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act. As a matter of interest to the Members, all medical facilities of the District of Columbia for the past 20 years have been financed by the Federal Government. The committee has added \$7,500,000 for manpower development and training activities.

In chapter IX, the committee has included \$25 million for flood control and coastal emergencies, under the Corps of Engineers. This estimate was submitted directly to the Senate and, hence, was not considered by the House. The funds are required to replace moneys reallocated from construction projects already under way, to meet emergency expenditures resulting from subtropical storms and heavy rains along the California coast early this year, as well as from the exceedingly heavy snowpack in the north central portion of the country which, together with the spring rains, produced unusually severe flooding. With the appropriation recommended, there will still be a deficit of at least \$290,000 in the emergency fund, with no reserve to meet any requirements that may arise during the June flood season in the upper Missouri River Basin, the Columbia River Basin, or flood conditions in other localities.

Forty-five million dollars is recommended for the plant and capital equipment account of the Atomic Energy Commission. These funds are needed to restore or replace as quickly as possible the weapons production facility at Rocky Flats, Colo., which was extensively damaged by fire on May 11, 1969.

For chapter X, which includes appropriations for the Departments of Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, a total of \$16,659,500 is recommended, an increase of \$1,636,000 over the House allowance and a reduction of \$1,806,850 below the amount requested. There are a number of appropriation accounts in this chapter. I shall not take the time of the Senate to spell them out. Perhaps it will suffice to point out that in this chapter alone 376 new positions have been authorized—11 for the processing of Customs cases; 30 new employees, attorneys and clerks, for the Tax Division and 18 for the Criminal Division, to intensify the fight against organized crime; 30 for the Civil Rights Division for the enforcement of titles I, VIII, and IX of the Civil Rights Act of 1968; 116 for U.S. attorneys and marshals, 43 of which are attorneys, 30 are deputy marshals, and 43 are clerks; 83 for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs; and 88 for the Judiciary accounts, of which 83 deputy clerks are needed to administer the new Random Jury Selection Act and five are needed to implement the survey required by the Federal Magistrate Act and the Random Jury Selection Act.

There is one item in chapter XI, Department of Transportation, which should be called to the Senate's attention. Under the Office of the Secretary, on page 42, the committee has recommended the sum of \$2 million for costs associated with the moving of units of the Department of Transportation to the Nassif Building in southwest, Washington, D.C. The request of \$4,634,000 was submitted to the Senate and, therefore, not considered by the House. The committee took into account the fact that only \$2 million would be required to fund the move until the end of the calendar year, permitting the balance of the funding requirements to be examined by the regular subcommittee in its processing of the annual bill for fiscal year 1970. The \$2 million, under the committee recommendation, would remain available until December 31, 1969, and would provide a net of \$200,000 for space occupancy costs and \$1,800,000 for other consolidation costs.

A total of \$4,298,000 is recommended for this chapter of the bill, which is \$2 million over the House allowance but a reduction of \$2,934,000 under the budget estimates submitted to the Senate.

For chapter XII, dealing with the Departments of the Treasury and Post Office, a total of \$2,695,000 is recommended, an increase of \$410,000 over the House allowance and \$60,000 under the budget requests. These items are explained beginning at page 44 of the report.

For claims and judgments, in chapter XIII, the committee recommends the full amount requested, \$18,188,688. This is \$1,307,876 over the House bill and is the result of later submissions to the Senate. These funds are provided for the mandatory payment of claims and judgments as determined by the departments and U.S. courts in accordance with the law.

Title III deals exclusively with increased pay costs which are mandatory under a variety of laws enacted by the Congress. The appropriations in this title are summarized on page 46 of the

report and in the detailed tabulation commencing on page 78. Pay costs provided in this title amount to \$1,368,137,556, which is an increase of \$184,839,102 over the House bill but \$96,596,840 under the amount requested. In addition, \$59,741,000 is made available through release of Public Law 90-364 reserves and \$87,916,000 by transfer from other appropriation categories.

I come now to title IV, which contains a provision inserted by the Senate committee as a substitute for that included in the House bill, and it relates to limitations on fiscal year 1970 outlays. This amendment is printed on page 70 of the bill.

Under the committee recommendation, the limitation on fiscal year 1970 outlays would be set at \$187.9 billion, which is \$5 billion less than President Nixon's request, which amounted, in his revised budget estimates, to \$192.9 billion. However, the committee provision also contains language which would exempt from the limitation so-called outlays to the extent that these outlays in fiscal year 1970 exceed outlays in fiscal year 1969. The committee desires to make it completely clear that the limitation, therefore, because of the exemption, may be exceeded by \$3.1 billion. It is estimated that \$3.1 billion is the amount social security, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions, public assistance grants, farm price supports, special support of Southeast Asia, and other unpredictable and uncontrollable items in 1970 exceed comparable figures for 1969. On the other hand, if these increases do not materialize, the limitation could not be exceeded otherwise. The increase of \$3.1 billion in uncontrollable items in fiscal year 1970 over comparable items for fiscal year 1969 is a net figure.

While a ceiling of \$187.9 billion is \$5 billion less than the revised budget, the committee wishes to point out that the savings may or may not be this large because of these exemptions. However, even with these estimated increases for the exemptions, the ceiling would be \$1.9 billion under the House ceiling and the revised budget, and at least this amount would be saved under the committee recommendation.

It is most difficult to estimate figures for the uncontrollable items. The January budget had certain figures which were revised by better information in the April 15 review. The committee has since been advised that the April 15 review figures are in line for another revision. Under the circumstances, the committee has recommended as a base for comparison for uncontrollable and unpredictable items the figures for fiscal year 1969, since these figures are now almost firm. The House provision which was stricken by the committee set a limitation on fiscal year 1970 outlays in the amount of the new President Nixon budget of \$192.9 billion. This figure would increase or decrease, depending upon the action or inaction of the Congress on the appropriation bills and other proposals. Under the Senate committee's recommendation, a definite reduction of at least \$1.9 billion has been recommended which will serve as an incentive to reduce the expenditure impact resulting from

action on appropriation bills by at least this amount.

In a period of rapidly rising prices with continuing inflationary pressures, it is essential that we act to contain the inflation and preserve the value of our currency.

The Congress will not have the opportunity to act on all of the appropriation bills and legislation that will affect 1970 expenditures before the new year starts this July 1. The lateness of appropriation and legislative action this year has been occasioned not only by the factors which have occurred in recent years, but also by the fact that the Congress had to await President Nixon's budget recommendations and they were not forthcoming until April 15.

Although the Senate has not yet completed action on a single 1970 appropriation bill, it is important for the economic health of the Nation that we provide a guideline that will influence us in the actions that we take on the individual bills as they come before us. It may be 3 or 4 more months before the bills are enacted. We must make our wishes known now so that whatever actions are required can be taken in time to restrain 1970 expenditures gradually with a minimum of dislocation and harm to important Federal programs and Federal services.

Title IV of the present bill, in both the House version and that reported by the committee, faces up to this responsibility. The committee version is more definite, more specific, and I believe more desirable than the provision approved by the House, for the following reasons:

First. Under the committee version, the Congress and the administration will know more precisely where they stand and actions can be taken accordingly; under the House bill, the action or inaction by the Congress will influence the ceiling limit, and there is no way of knowing for quite a number of months exactly what the impact will be on those programs over which we exercise annual control.

Second. The committee faces the realities forced upon us by legislation and events which have already taken place. For example, it makes no attempt to restrict expenditures for unpredictable increases or decreases in interest on the public debt; in veterans' pension and compensation; in social security benefits; in other retirement benefits, such as civil service, railroad retirement, and foreign service retirement. Further, it will similarly not force restrictive action, the consequences we cannot foretell in cases of other public services, because of the contingencies of the heating up of the military situation in Southeast Asia. These exceptions provided in section 401(a) (1) and (2) are beyond the control of the Executive in the coming year and many of them are beyond the control of the Congress. The House bill would have made it mandatory that the Congress act now or the President act later to find savings on the contingency that these programs and costs would exceed the revised budget estimate—which in any case can be no more than a guess for such volatile programs as farm price supports, medicaid, public assistance grants, and others.

Third. The committee bill removes any question that the President has the authority to take the actions required to bring expenditures within the limits it provides. At the same time, it makes clear that the President need not take any action if the Congress itself succeeds, in its individual appropriation actions, in reducing expenditures to the limits provided. The House bill, on the other hand, fails on both these counts.

Finally, the Senate bill is an ironclad guarantee of a reduction of at least \$1.9 billion in spending for those programs subject to control by the Congress and the President this year, whereas the effect of the House bill is unknown and uncertain.

The spending limitation is similar in many respects to that included last year as section 202 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. The main difference, aside from the specific figures involved, has to do with more complete certainty as to the programs that would be affected by the limitation. Under last year's provision, changes from the originally estimated expenditures were suggested to revise the limitation only for Southeast Asia support, interest on the debt, veterans' benefits and services, social security trust funds, public assistance grants only up to \$560 million over the original budget estimate, and price support operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation only up to \$907 million over the original budget estimate. In addition to these items, the committee bill would also allow the limitation to be revised—up or down—by changes in other programs which are similarly uncontrollable in the year ahead. For example, civil service retirement, railroad retirement, delivery of mail, subsidies under existing contracts for maritime wages, payments under low-rent housing contracts, and similar programs.

The committee provision also bases the calculation of these uncontrollable changes on a firmer foundation than last year's bill by using the difference between the 1970 expenditures and the actual 1969 outlays for the relatively uncontrollable programs. The 1969 figure will be known in a few weeks and provides a sound benchmark with no degree of uncertainty; last year's law, on the other hand, put the changes in terms of the difference between one guess and another guess—namely, the original budget estimate for a band of volatile programs which have to be reestimated and revised periodically throughout the year.

Briefly, the House bill, if all the administration's estimates turn out to be correct, does not guarantee any reduction in the budget recommended by President Nixon. It provides no firm guidance to the Congress in its actions on the budget requests. The committee bill, on the other hand, makes abundantly clear the fact that we must aim for lower spending, and it guarantees a reduction in those programs over which we and the administration can exercise control under existing law.

The committee bill, in addition, provides a firm base on which the administration can make plans as to how it would take the actions required to reduce spending with minimum harm to public services, and it can make those plans

now. If congressional action makes administrative action unnecessary, those plans could be laid aside. The House bill, however, leaves the President with an unknown quantity. It makes sound administration with minimum harm to public services extremely difficult of attainment. The President's position is almost untenable. He cannot act affirmatively and positively until he knows the impact of final action on all his budget requests—which result will not be completed until the year is perhaps almost half gone.

With the large growth in various guaranteed Government benefits and services in the post-World War II era, a significant portion of the Federal budget has remained beyond annual congressional—or Executive—control through the appropriation process.

For example, I think it might be of interest to note in this regard, Mr. President, that the total appropriations requests for fiscal year 1970 amount to circa \$210 billion, whereas the amount over which Congress can exercise control is only about \$143 billion.

During this post World War II period, no administration, Republican or Democratic, has been able to estimate the flow of these uncontrollable payments with accuracy. This history indicates the magnitude and the burden of the job the President would have if the House bill were enacted. The committee bill removes the greatest part of this uncertainty.

These important distinctions, I believe, make the superiority of the Senate position beyond question.

I might add that, based on current estimates, the Federal outlays in the current year are expected to amount to \$185.6 billion, which is \$6.7 billion more than in 1968.

The 1970 estimate of \$191 billion—the \$187.9 billion mentioned in title IV plus the \$3.1 billion change in uncontrollable costs—is \$5.4 billion greater than the current 1969 estimate. This is a reduction in the growth of the budget that we are planning, but some growth to meet our real obligations, as previously mentioned must be allowed. It is essential to the continued health of the economy and the commitments we have made to our aged and veterans, our educational and health institutions.

The final section of the bill, title V, contains language inserted by the committee repealing section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968—Public Law 90-364. In essence, this section had provided that only three out of four vacancies in the executive branch may be filled, until the June 30, 1966, level of employment had been reached for the entire Federal Government. Further, the provision required that Federal employment be maintained at that June 1966 level.

Subsequently, the Congress exempted certain agencies and programs from the application of this section.

Testimony before the committee on the present bill convinced the committee that the provision, which was designed to promote economy and efficiency in Government, has had a reverse effect—it is extravagant in its impact and too

rigid for the effective utilization of manpower.

In the case of the Social Security Administration, employee overtime has had to be substituted for regular time in order to meet the increasing workloads. The statement was made that it has cost roughly \$6 million more in fiscal year 1969 to process the work done on overtime than if that work had been performed on a regular-time basis. Additionally, some important purchases have had to be postponed and certain activities deferred to meet the stringencies imposed by the employee limitation.

The experience of the Treasury Department has been similar. Testimony in the hearings indicated that the Bureau of Customs, because of insufficient manpower, has been unable to examine all mailed packages, which has resulted in an estimated loss of between \$30 to \$40 million in revenue. The Internal Revenue Services reports that there has been an estimated revenue loss in fiscal year 1969 of \$500 million and the loss might be as high as \$1 billion if the restrictions are not lifted for fiscal year 1970.

Other examples of the undesirable, and unanticipated, effects of these personnel restrictions are cited in the committee hearings, copies of which are available to you.

Of significant interest is the fact that the House of Representatives, on May 27, passed two appropriation bills for fiscal year 1970—the Department of Agriculture and the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office appropriation bills—which contained similar provisions, removing the agencies covered in these bills, for fiscal year 1970 only, from the personnel limitations imposed by section 201. These bills are now receiving the attention of the Senate subcommittees having jurisdiction.

It is the committee's opinion that the application of section 201 of Public Law 90-364 has resulted in the ineffective deployment of personnel, inefficient use of overtime, the interruption or curtailment of essential services, and costly losses in revenue expected in several areas of the Government's operations during the fiscal year.

Therefore, the committee recommends that section 201 be repealed outright, and permanently, rather than on a departmental or yearly basis, and has thus inserted language in the accompanying bill to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. President, this concludes my presentation on this supplemental appropriation bill. I shall be happy to try to respond to any questions Senators may have. I do not claim to have all the answers, but the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, will be available to assist in answering questions. Other members of the subcommittee will also be available.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator withhold that request for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations for the exemplary support they have rendered to me and for the extremely fine cooperation that they have accorded me in the consideration of the pending bill.

They have been available at all times. We have met on Sunday afternoons. We have met on Saturdays. We have met in the evenings, and we have met in the mornings. They have been available at any time that would suit my convenience. I am very grateful to them. And particularly am I very grateful to the chief clerk, Mr. Tom Scott.

Without the knowledge and experience, the assistance and advice and counsel given to me by the staff, I would have found the job impossible of performance. I express my gratitude to them.

I also thank the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, for the support he has given throughout the hearings and throughout the markup of the bill.

I also express appreciation to the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG), the ranking minority member of the full committee and to the other minority and

majority members of the subcommittee and the full committee for the help they have rendered in bringing the bill to the floor of the Senate.

I shall now be glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware, but first I ask the Senator if he would be willing for me to put in a quorum call so that the Senator from South Dakota may come to the Chamber.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point pages 3 through 7 of the committee report, which is a summary tabulation giving a comparison between the budget estimates, House allowances, and the Senate committee recommendations for all types of authority contained in this bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED
IN THE BILL—SUMMARY

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
TITLE I						
	Military operations in Southeast Asia:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	\$1,496,900,000	\$1,234,000,000	\$1,272,000,000	—\$224,900,000	+\$38,000,000
	By transfer.....			(8,910,000)	(+8,910,000)	(+8,910,000)
TITLE II						
I	Agriculture:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	13,118,000	9,118,000	13,118,000		+4,000,000
II	Defense:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	249,682,000	226,050,000	227,950,000	—21,732,000	+1,900,000
	By transfer.....			(9,377,000)	(+9,377,000)	(+9,377,000)
III	District of Columbia:					
	Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority.....	29,736,000	10,365,000	29,101,000	—635,000	+18,736,000
	District of Columbia funds:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	(44,607,000)	(25,353,000)	(44,089,000)	(—518,000)	(+18,736,000)
IV	Foreign operations:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	162,853,000	2,700,000	160,000,000	—2,853,000	+157,300,000
	By transfer.....	(38,000)	(35,000)	(2,735,000)	(+2,697,000)	(+2,700,000)
V	Independent offices—Housing and Urban Development:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1968.....	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000		
	1969.....	494,502,000	306,062,000	488,116,000	—6,386,000	+182,054,000
	Total.....	501,670,000	313,230,000	495,284,000	—6,386,000	+182,054,000
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....	(104,500,000)	(82,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(—2,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)		

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED

IN THE BILL—SUMMARY—Continued

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—),	
					Senate bill compared with—	House bill
TITLE II—Continued						
VI	Interior: New budget (obligational) authority— Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves— By transfer— Liquidation cash—	\$65,136,000	\$54,227,000	\$64,225,000	—\$911,000	+\$9,998,000
		(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)		
		(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)		
		(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)		
VII	Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare: New budget (obligational) authority— Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves— (Limitation on salaries and expenses—trust funds)— By transfer—	713,707,000	713,707,000	714,966,000	+1,259,000	+1,259,000
		(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)		
		(16,500,000)		(21,200,000)	(+4,700,000)	(+21,200,000)
		(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)		
VIII	Legislative branch: New budget (obligational) authority: 1968 1969	126,900	30,000	126,900	+60,000	+126,900
				60,000		+30,000
IX	Public works—	70,000,000		70,000,000		+70,000,000
X	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary: New budget (obligational) authority: 1968 1969	860,000	10,000	860,000		+850,000
		17,606,350	15,013,500	15,799,500	—1,806,850	+786,000
XI	Transportation: New budget (obligational) authority— Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves— By transfer—	18,466,350	15,023,500	16,659,500	—1,806,850	+1,636,000
		(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)		
		(147,000)	(147,000)	(147,000)		
		(220,000)	(220,000)	(220,000)		(+147,000)
XII	Treasury—Post Office: New budget (obligational) authority— Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves— By transfer—	7,232,000	2,298,000	4,298,000	—2,934,000	+2,000,000
		(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)		
		2,755,000	2,285,000	2,695,000	—60,000	+410,000
		(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)		
XIII	Claims and judgments— Total, title II: New budget (obligational) authority: 1968 1969	18,188,688	16,880,812	18,188,688		+1,307,876
		8,154,900	7,178,000	8,154,900		+976,900
		1,844,516,038	1,358,736,312	1,808,517,188	—35,998,850	+449,780,876
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations— Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves— Limitation increases— By transfer— Liquidation cash—	1,852,670,938	1,365,914,312	1,816,672,088	—35,998,850	+450,757,776
		(104,500,000)	(82,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(—2,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
		(20,489,000)	(20,489,000)	(20,489,000)		
		(16,647,000)	(16,647,000)	(21,347,000)	(+4,700,000)	(+21,347,000)
		(11,229,000)	(11,229,000)	(23,306,000)	(+12,074,000)	(+12,077,000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED

IN THE BILL—SUMMARY—Continued

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	
					Senate bill compared with—	House bill
					Budget estimate	
	Increased pay costs (included above):					
	Budget authority	(\$135,378,400)	(\$116,435,000)	(\$124,846,400)	(—\$10,532,000)	(+\$8,411,000)
	Release of reserves	(18,589,000)	(18,589,000)	(18,589,000)		
	By transfer	(1,386,000)	(1,383,000)	(3,983,000)	(+2,597,000)	(+2,600,000)
	Total	(155,353,400)	(136,407,400)	(147,418,400)	(—7,935,000)	(+11,011,000)
	TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS					
	New budget (obligational) authority					
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	1,464,734,396	1,183,293,454	1,368,137,556	—96,596,840	+184,839,102
	By transfer	(59,510,000)	(62,277,000)	(59,741,000)	(+231,000)	(—2,536,000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(85,873,000)	(81,676,000)	(87,916,000)	(+2,043,000)	(+6,240,000)
	Total	(24,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(—2,000,000)	
	TITLE V					
	General Provisions					
	Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill (H. Doc. 91-50)	(630,000)	(630,000)	(630,000)		
	RECAPITULATION					
	Grand total, titles I, II, III, and V:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1968	8,154,900	7,178,000	8,154,900		+976,900
	1969	4,806,150,434	3,776,034,766	4,448,654,774	—357,495,690	+672,619,978
	Total	4,814,305,334	3,783,212,766	4,456,809,644	—357,495,690	+673,596,878
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations	(104,500,000)	(82,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(—2,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(79,999,000)	(82,766,000)	(80,230,000)	(+231,000)	(—2,536,000)
	By transfer	(97,105,000)	(92,905,000)	(120,132,000)	(+23,027,000)	(+27,227,000)
	Liquidation cash	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)		
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(40,870,000)	(22,223,000)	(43,570,000)	(+2,700,000)	(+21,347,000)
	Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds or personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill	(630,000)	(630,000)	(630,000)		
	Increased pay costs (included above):					
	Budget authority	(1,600,112,796)	(1,299,733,854)	(1,492,983,956)	(—107,128,840)	(+193,250,102)
	Release of reserves	(78,099,000)	(80,866,000)	(78,330,000)	(+231,000)	(—2,536,000)
	By transfer	(87,259,000)	(83,059,000)	(91,899,000)	(+4,640,000)	(+8,840,000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(24,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(—2,000,000)	

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED
IN THE BILL—SUMMARY—Continued

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
RECAPITULATION—Continued						
	and V: Increased pay costs (in- cluded above):					
	Increases in limita- tions and trans- fers from trust funds for per- sonal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill.....	(\$630,000)	(\$630,000)	(\$630,000)	-----	-----
	Total.....	(1,790,323,796)	(1,486,511,854)	(1,686,065,956)	(-104,257,840)	(+199,554,102)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, as ranking Republican member of this subcommittee, I should like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for the workmanlike job he has done on this supplemental bill. It is a large bill, and it continued to grow larger as time elapsed, primarily because new items came in as a consequence of the applicable date of new legislation. Consequently, there is a reason why it is substantially larger than the House proposal. A number of items, as the Senator has set forth, were brought into the picture and were heard for the first time on the Senate side, because the time situation was such that they were not applicable or pertinent at the time the House hearings were held.

I know of no supplemental piece of legislation of this kind, in appropriations, which has had the painstaking, careful analysis that this one has received from the committee. We were able to effectuate a few economies—not as many as I would have liked, and not as many, I am sure, as the chairman would have liked—but I think we have placed before the Senate a measure which deserves to be supported by our colleagues and taken to the conference to work out the adjudications between the two bodies.

I would especially recommend against efforts to increase these appropriations, because of the tight-money situation in the country and because, wherever the committee deemed possible, we did make reductions.

In one or two instances, we did not vote items which were included in the House proposal, because the evidence was not presented to the Senate committee. In those areas, we anticipate going to conference with the House conferees with open minds; and because they have heard testimony in some instances which we did not hear, we will expect to meet with them and work out some compromise formula, if in fact we do not accede entirely to the House action.

We have arranged to clarify one or two items of this measure which will be handled by amendments during the

course of the consideration of the bill, but I can recommend it to Senators as a determination which has been carefully arrived at, and has been arrived at by a group of Senators resolved to do what we could to protect the economy of the country.

I again congratulate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who operates in that capacity now for the first time and who indicates clearly that he is going to be a very successful and useful chairman of the subcommittee handling supplemental and deficiency appropriations.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator for his very generous remarks.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason thereof.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator from West Virginia will withhold that request temporarily. There are some questions I wish to ask. Before we agree on the request perhaps we can get some answers to those questions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Very well. Mr. President, I withhold my request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to ask the Senator some questions first in connection with title IV of the bill, relating to expenditure controls. I wish to get a clear understanding of what is being proposed here.

Under section 401 it states that expenditures and net lending—budget outlays—of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$187.9 billion.

On the surface that would look like a \$5 billion reduction in what the House agreed upon. I wish to ask several questions about some of the provisos involved.

The section continues:

Provided, That such amount shall be increased or decreased by the aggregate amount by which the sum of expenditures and net lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser than the sum of expenditures and net lending in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for—

(1) items designated "Open-ended pro-

grams and fixed costs" in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-first Congress).

Turning to page 16 of the budget, under "Open-ended programs and fixed costs," the first item we find is social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds. The budget estimate in 1969 is \$39.6 billion for these items, according to page 16. The projected budget for 1970 is \$42.4 billion, or an increase of \$2.9 billion.

Let us take that one example. We will assume for the moment these items are correct. Under those circumstances does it mean that the \$187.9 billion ceiling would be increased by the \$2.9 billion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If I understand the Senator's question, the answer would be "yes," assuming the expenditure figures stated.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my understanding. That one item would increase the amount of \$187.9 billion by \$2.9 billion.

My next question deals with the next item and relates to the interest on the national debt. In 1969 that figure is projected to \$15.2 billion, while the 1970 projection is \$16 billion. Again assuming those are the projected rates, that would be an increase of \$800 million; and as I understand, under this committee formula that would automatically increase the expenditure ceiling again by another \$800 million. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. While we are on that point, assume for the moment that the interest on the national debt were increased by another \$500 million—and it looks very likely that as a result of the spiraling interest rates it will be—beyond what had been estimated in the 1970 budget; and assuming there were this extra \$500 million, would that be added to the original figure also and automatically increase the ceiling by another \$500 million?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is the answer "yes" on that item?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Continuing further, on page 16 we have the item of civilian and military pay increase. There was no allocation for this item in 1969, but they estimate a cost of \$2.8 billion for 1970. As I understand the situation, under this committee formula that would add another \$2.8 billion to the ceiling. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, because the figure of \$2.8 billion for this item has already been included in the uncontrollable category.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the Senator from West Virginia will find the answer is "yes."

An application is pending before the committees for a further salary increase for postal employees and certain other employees, which I have seen estimated at various figures. However, the nearest extra cost figure I have seen agreed upon was around \$500 million or \$600 million if that increase were to go through. If that amount or any other amount as a

result of legislation increasing salaries were added, would that automatically add to the ceiling to the extent it was agreed upon?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Salary increases are uncontrollable and any increases over the estimate would be added.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The answer is "yes"?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The next item on page 16 is "Veterans' pensions, compensation, and insurance." Under the 1969 estimate the estimated cost figure is \$5.6 billion; under the 1970 estimate the estimate is \$5.9 billion, or an increase of \$200 million when the figures are rounded out. That would bring about another increase in the committee's ceiling of \$200 million. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It would be an increase in the uncontrollables.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And the ceiling would be automatically increased by that much?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. The ceiling would be increased by any increase in uncontrollable items over the estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. "Public assistance grants, including medicaid" shows an estimate for 1969 of \$6.3 billion, an estimate for 1970 of \$7.4 billion, or an increase of \$1.1 billion. As I understand the formula, the \$187.9 billion ceiling would again be increased automatically by that amount.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The answer to this and the other questions is this: Any increase in uncontrollables is going to automatically raise the \$187.9 billion ceiling.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Just as increases in uncontrollables would raise the \$192.9 billion estimate submitted by the President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. The point I make is, assuming there are no other increases beyond those referred to in the estimates, these figures I have just stated are already in the budget, and even if budget expenditures are held the same as in the 1970 budget these increases I am referring to and have referred to in previous questions would automatically raise the ceiling, or if perchance the requests are below those amounts, they would reduce the figures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the increases in the uncontrollables in fiscal year 1970 over these in fiscal year 1969, a portion of the list of which the Senator read into the RECORD, turn out to be as estimated, they will amount to \$3.1 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We will tabulate them in just a moment; however, those additions just referred to thus far raise the ceiling of the committee bill by around \$7.5 billion, but this will be reduced by the proposed reduction of \$3.4 billion in the cost of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

The point I make is that the committee amendment is not an effective ceiling on expenditures at all. It is only a pious hope.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That being the case, \$3.1 billion will be added to the \$187.9 billion, and this would create a ceiling total of \$191 billion from which to work.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall get to the exact total in just a minute.

Now let us examine what the committee did on farm price supports, Commodity Credit Corporation—that item includes soil bank payments. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. All expenditures which may be made under the Commodity Credit Corporation, which includes food-for-peace programs, school lunch programs, and so forth—all of the expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporations, as I understand it, are exempted from control under the committee amendment. The 1969 estimate is a \$3.6 billion cost for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in the budget, page 16, to which the bill refers, the 1970 estimate is \$3.1 billion, or a reduction of \$500 million. If that were true that would mean a reduction of \$500 million in the overall ceiling. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is reading from a budget printed in January.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am reading from the same budget to which the committee bill referred.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have the latest figures submitted by the Bureau of the Budget on May 20.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The bill does not refer to figures of May 20 but specifically refers to the budget, page 16.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. My figures—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what is confusing. These estimates of the committee bill are merely a guess, not a mandatory ceiling on expenditures. I shall not say the committee amendment is a farce, but from an effective standpoint, it has no value.

The Senator, in his remarks, keeps referring to some figures furnished to him at a subsequent date, but I am reading from the bill that I have before me. The bill refers to the "open-end program and fixed costs" in the table on page 16 of the Budget of the United States. It does not refer to any other figures. This is legislation we are acting upon—items which include social security; medicare and other social insurance, trust funds; interest on the national debt; civilian military pay increases, past, present, and future; veterans' pensions, compensation, and insurance; public assistance grants, including medicaid; farm price supports, which includes every type of operation under the Commodity Credit Corporation; postal operation, directly related to mail volume which means pretty much all of the postal deficit, whatever it may be; legislative and judiciary expenditures; and then, just in the event some have been missed, we find the word "other" included.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Which amounts to \$2.1 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Apparently it has gained \$500 million since the budget was printed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am giving the Senator the latest figures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then it has gained \$500 million in the past 3 months. But the point is, those are all exempted under this program. I am just wondering whether we really have a ceiling because, as I tabulate it, the items on page 16 of the budget add back \$7.3 billion to the \$187.9 billion. That raises it to \$195 billion as the ceiling. However, in fairness, it should be pointed out that the \$195.2 billion ceiling at that point, in paragraph 1, will be reduced some by paragraph 2 under the item designated as "Special Southeast Asia Support." In the table on page 27 of the budget, the estimate is \$28.8 billion in 1969, but 1970 is projected at \$25.4 billion, which is a reduction of \$3.4 billion. This would reduce this earlier figure by \$3.4 billion.

I am wondering, is the committee not misleading the American people when it talks about enacting a ceiling of \$187.9 billion and then turns around and has all these items added. The committee may not be doing so intentionally, but it is giving the American people the wrong impression. Then there are other increases in other sections dealing with aid to schools in federally impacted areas under the act of September 23 and 30, 1950.

I have not been able to get that estimate, but I understand it is around \$200 million. I am wondering whether the committee has not proposed a ceiling which is applicable to everything except Government expenditures.

I point out these inconsistencies only to show the complete fallacy of using the committee formula. It is not a realistic figure.

I want to ask the Senator this question: If, in the course of the appropriations this year or in the legislative process in the weeks ahead, Congress liberalizes any of these programs beyond what was projected in the 1970 budget where they will cost \$1 million or \$1 billion, would such action not automatically increase the ceiling by that same amount? As I understand it Congress would not have to touch the ceiling but merely authorize the extra \$1 billion on any of the programs and, it automatically raises the ceiling.

If that is not true would the Senator point out what prevents it?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No; we or the President would have to make an offsetting cut in the controllable items for any appropriation increases we may make in controllable items elsewhere.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That sounds nice; but what language in the committee amendment says that, because I cannot find it?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The language in the bill, which specifically requires a reduction of \$1.9 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, now, let me read it—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me read it for the Senator—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I read from the bill:

Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions not less than \$1.9 billion—

If we place a period right there, that would be all right, but it continues—

in expenditures and net lending, the amounts recommended in the April review of the 1970 budget, for programs other than those designated in subparagraphs (1) (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

I repeat, "other than those designated in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3)." That is the loophole.

Thus, what appears to be an ironclad ceiling, has left the barn door open. If this interpretation is wrong I think that we would need a modification of language stating that under no circumstances could it go beyond that ceiling of \$187.9 billion; otherwise, it can go up to \$195 billion under this formula—it really can go anywhere. I read again this exception:

Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1.9 billion in expenditures and net lending, below the amounts recommended in the April review of the 1970 budget, for programs other than those designated in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

What I am worried and concerned about is that if we roll back certain expenditures by \$1.9 billion in the programs that are not included in those exemptions, Congress could increase spending by \$10 billion in the exempted areas and end up with a \$200 billion expenditure level. Is that not true?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of course. That was true in connection with the legislation that was passed last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was not true.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Oh yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I beg the Senator's pardon. Not under the amendment I sponsored last year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Maybe I misunderstand the Senator, but it would have the effect of raising the overall ceiling.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would, but last year the ceiling could be raised only by affirmative action of Congress. We had several efforts made on the floor to make exceptions for the TVA and various other agencies, including the Post Office Department, but Congress did that affirmatively. It was not automatic. I realize that any ceiling we agree on today can be changed by legislative action of Congress tomorrow. I think if we are going to have a ceiling it should be a solid ceiling. The ceiling as it passed the Senate last year did not cover the trust funds payments because the trust fund payments can only be changed by congressional action as we raise or lower the payments for social security or retirement. I agree on that. We spelled out that the veterans benefits, which were mandatory under existing law, would be exempted. The reason we did that was to make sure that veterans and those on social security would be paid. They were not affected by that or by this ceiling. The only other exemption made in the proposal offered by the former Senator from Florida, Mr. Smathers, and I was the interest on the national debt as far as domestic programs were concerned. The cost of the Vietnam war was also

exempted since this is an uncontrollable item.

Later there were a series of actions which were taken by Congress, but those later exemptions were approved over the objections of some of us. But, nevertheless, if we have an ironclad ceiling let us have one, then both Congress and the country as a whole will know when we violate that ceiling.

What bothers me in the committee proposal is that we give the impression that we are cutting the budget by \$5 billion below the House figure when, in reality, we are doing nothing of the kind.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will just allow me, I will attempt to clarify the matter for him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am glad to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We do not say that we make a net reduction in expenditures of \$5 billion. We merely take the President's revised estimate of \$192.9 billion and lower that ceiling by \$5 billion, to the figure of \$187.9 billion. Then we say that that amount of \$187.9 billion shall be increased or decreased by the aggregate amounts, and in simple language, this means the aggregate amounts of increases of uncontrollables in fiscal year 1970 over the amount for uncontrollables in fiscal year 1969. Based on the latest estimate, that figure is \$3.1 billion. So we are saying that we are lowering the ceiling to \$187.9 billion, and we then increase that by \$3.1 billion, which is the amount by which the uncontrollables in fiscal year 1970 are estimated to exceed the amount spent for uncontrollables in fiscal year 1969.

The figure would then be 191 billion, which would constitute a reduction of \$1.9 billion from the President's revised budget request of \$192 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps I do not see it, but in section 401, where does it refer to the budget of \$192.9 billion as submitted by the President? As I read the bill all it refers to is the \$195.3 billion submitted by President Johnson. Maybe it is in here, but I do not see it. Where is it?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will allow me to complete my sentence—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think the language which is confusing the Senator is that which is on page 71 of the bill, which reads as follows:

Items designated "Open ended programs and fixed costs" in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States—

That language identifies the items. It does not identify the amounts. I think that is what is confusing the Senator.

It merely identifies the unpredictable item of Southeast Asia operations and the uncontrollable, fixed cost, or open-ended items such as social security, veterans' pensions and compensation, interest on the national debt, price support, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Assuming for the moment that the senator is correct, it still does not identify the amounts.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No; I did

not say that. I said it identifies the items, but not the amounts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When does it identify the amounts?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator has to go to the Bureau of the Budget to get the amount by which fiscal 1970 expenditures for uncontrollables is estimated to exceed the expenditures for uncontrollables in 1969.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, I see. This is subject to change every day.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, not at all. We take the \$3.1 billion figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Whatever the Director of the Budget says today. Tomorrow may be different.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, but I got the figures—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Are they not subject to change at a later date? The Senator may have the figures, but we are acting on the committee bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will just let me finish my sentence—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Of course.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of course, the figures for fiscal year 1969 cannot be absolutely definite at this point, because fiscal year 1969 has not yet run its course; but the very best up-to-date estimates that can be gotten indicate that the amount by which the uncontrollables will exceed in 1970 the amount spent in fiscal year 1969 is \$3.1 billion. That, added to \$187.9 billion, comes to \$191 billion, which is \$1.9 billion under the \$192.9 billion in the President's revised estimates.

To tie that figure down and make sure that the Congress and/or the administration are obligated to make a reduction in controllable expenditures in 1970 by that much at least, we put the language in the bill to the effect that "Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1,900,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator will admit, will he not, that under any interpretation his answer is confusing? First, the bill refers to the budget on page 16, then the Senator refers to the budget submitted by President Nixon in April, now we are told it is the budget figures given to the Senator from West Virginia last week. What will it be tomorrow? The fact is there are still these exemptions for the open-ended programs under which it is possible that, no matter what is provided in the bill, the expenditures for fiscal 1970 could go over \$200 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of course, we do not foresee, nor can we foresee, what the expenditures are going to be for the uncontrollable items, but we do say we are going to have to make a \$1.9 billion reduction in the controllables.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the point I am making is this. The Senator is talking about uncontrollable items; for example, Commodity Credit Corporation payments and farm price supports. Why are they uncontrollable? We have in committee a proposal, which I strongly support and which was cleared in the House, which limited agricultural payments to \$20,000. Several hundred mil-

lions of dollars in savings are involved in that item. Congress can control this program, so that is a controllable item.

Conceivably, Congress can pass laws liberalizing support payments, but it is a controllable item. Congress can control it.

I will grant the Senator that interest on the national debt is not controllable in the Congress. We can pass all the debt ceilings we want to, but we have to pay the going price on the marketplace. To me, interest charges is an uncontrollable item.

Social security payments are paid under a trust fund, so it is an item that can be controlled by Congress. I regret that we are trying to count it as if it were normal revenue, though, for the purpose of claiming a balanced budget.

Proceeding further, Congress authorizes expenditures for the legislative and judicial branches of the Government. Certainly they are all controllable items, and yet they are listed as uncontrollable by the committee bill.

I have discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget. For example, an increase in postage rates has been requested effective July 1 which would bring in \$519 million next year. I have been told that to the extent that Congress does not act, that, too, will increase by \$500 million the figure which the committee has in its version of a ceiling. That ceiling is automatically increased by inaction of Congress to enact the postage increases asked for. I think the Senator will agree with that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator has mentioned several matters. We may be dealing in semantics. We have used the word "uncontrollable." I have used the word "uncontrollable" to include items that may be controllable but are unpredictable. For example, expenditures for Southeast Asia are estimated to be \$25.2 billion. They are not exactly uncontrollable, but they are unpredictable, and they have been exempted as uncontrollable under this bill. We may be talking about open-ended items, such as public assistance grants. We may be talking about fixed costs such as interest on the national debt. We may be talking about unpredictable items such as Southeast Asia expenditures. But they have all been placed in the "exempt" category.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The price support programs come under the exempt provision, and they can be controlled in the future if Congress wants to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are controllable items. Likewise, expenditures for the legislative branch are controllable. Why are they exempted?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is true that that is controllable by the legislative branch, but the Senator does not contend, does he, that if the President were forced to make a reduction of \$1.9 billion, or any portion of it, he would attempt to make the reduction in the legislative branch?

That is why we have exempted the legislative item here.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It might have been a good thing if he had.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Well, it might or might not have been a good thing, but he is not going to, and the Senator knows that. That is why we have exempted that item.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why the judiciary?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do not think the President would want to cut the judiciary. Does the Senator believe he would?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Frankly, I am beginning to wonder if Congress is going to cut anything. That is what is bothering me.

I am one who feels we have got to make these reductions. I feel very strongly that we have also got to extend the surcharge. But, on the other hand, if we are going to extend the surcharge only to pour an additional \$8 to \$10 billion into the Treasury with no control over its spending, where it can roll right on out in increased spending, I think we have not only not accomplished anything but have defeated our purpose. That is the reason why I want a bona fide, realistic control over spending if we are going to enact one. Let us not fool the taxpayers on a meaningless statement.

I realize that, just as it happened last year, no matter how tight we may make the expenditure controls, Congress can by subsequent action release those controls. I recognize that, and perhaps that is what would be done again. It was done in several instances last year, as the Senator knows.

But at least every time Congress raised that ceiling last year, or released those controls on some agency, every Member of Congress knew about it. Our constituents back home knew about it. It was all open and aboveboard, because Congress had to take affirmative action to raise the ceiling.

As I understand the situation here, we can go back home and boast of the fact that in the Senate we have cut expenditures by \$5 billion more than the House cut, but in reality it is not a reduction at all.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No. By \$1.9 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Well, why talk of \$187.9 billion being \$5 billion less than the House figure?

We cannot even be assured we will have cut \$1.9 billion in total expenditures, because the bill has opened up so many loopholes. We exempted last year the interest on the national debt, as Congress cannot control it; by the same token, neither the President nor the Treasury Department could increase such expenditures because interest on money is a fixed charge in the money market. It is much different from taking a grant program or a program like the agricultural program. These can be controlled. I think we have entirely too many exemptions here if we want to have realistic control.

As far as I am concerned, I would rather fix the figure, whatever it is, be it \$190 billion or \$187 billion. I certainly could support that on the basis that if we cannot get \$187 billion we will get \$190 billion.

But whatever figure we take, let us

take a figure in good faith, with an iron-clad ceiling, so that it can be exceeded only by affirmative action and rollcall votes right here in Congress.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The junior Senator from Kentucky has been on his feet for quite some time. I yield to him first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL in the chair). The junior Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, as to incorporating in the bill the ceiling of \$187.9 billion, does he not think it is rather odd to first put on a ceiling, and then, on pages 71 and 72, of that \$187.9 billion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. How does the Senator arrive at his figure of \$124 billion?

Mr. COOK. The committee exempts everything on page 16 of the original bill, whatever that would be.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Exempts those items, but not the amounts.

Mr. COOK. If we exempt those items as being uncontrollable items, and those items on page 16 amount to \$108.9 billion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is referring to a budget which was printed in January.

Mr. COOK. These are the amounts the bill refers to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, the items are referred to, by way of identification, but not the amounts.

Mr. COOK. Well, then, let us put the amounts back to what they were in fiscal 1969, \$90.2 billion, and, in the case of the Southeast Asia situation, \$28.8 billion; so, in that case, the uncontrollable total would be, not \$124.2 billion, but about \$115 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No; if the Senator will use his pencil, I will give him the amounts.

Mr. COOK. All right. But what in fact we are saying, by writing this bill and putting in a limitation, is that we can control \$63.7 billion of this \$187.9 billion, but that we cannot control the increase or decrease of \$124.2 billion, or whatever figure the Senator wishes to suggest; is that not true?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We cannot control them unless we do as the Senator from Delaware says. Of course, we can control some of these items, but they are considered unpredictable or open-ended.

Last year we started out with a certain number of exemptions, which were added to as the session proceeded. In this instance, we are starting out at the beginning with exemptions, and we are specifically listing them, so that Congress and the President will both know the exact amount by which the controllable items are to be reduced, and what items can be so reduced.

Mr. COOK. But did the Senator not reply to the Senator from Delaware that if the figure in the uncontrollables were to go up as much as 5 percent, we would have to seek a reduction in controllables?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, I did not.

Mr. COOK. I thought that was exactly what the Senator said.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I did not.

Mr. COOK. He said we would have to reduce the controllables.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I said if Congress increased the controllables in one area, it would have to make offsetting deductions in the controllables in another. If I used the word "uncontrollable," I did not intend to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the question I asked was, would it not be conceivable for Congress to reduce the so-called controllable items by the \$1.9 billion and at the same time increase the open-end items, the ones referred to as uncontrollable, by \$10.9 billion if he wanted to, and have an additional \$9 billion spending overall?

Mr. COOK. That is correct. I should also like to know from the Senator—I assume some of the gentlemen up here in the Press Gallery will be writing in newspapers that the President of the United States shall effect reductions of not less than \$1.9 billion, and there may be people all over the country who will read that he has got to effect a reduction of \$1.9 billion, except that he cannot work in the category that constitutes, in the language of this bill, an uncontrollable account, and the total of such accounts could reach as much as \$124.2 billion out of \$187.9 billion. Is that not correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of course. And that was correct last year.

Mr. COOK. And that the only reduction he could make, if he can make one, is within the controllables, and if the uncontrollables get out of hand, there would be no reduction at all?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The able Senator is correct. That should be understood by anyone and everyone.

Mr. COOK. All right.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield now to the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, as I recall, last year due to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the former Senator from Florida, Mr. SMATHERS, there was a limitation of \$6 billion fixed by Congress as a minimum reduction of expenditures.

I think what happened was that that \$6 billion reduction in expenditures was maintained in the controllable expenditures, but there were uncontrollable expenditures which increased by about \$3.8 billion, and as a result, we had a net decrease of about \$2 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, the increase of \$6.2 billion in uncontrollables just about washed out the decrease of \$6.7 billion in the controllables.

Mr. COOPER. Well, there was some surplus claimed; as I recall, about \$2.1 billion.

My question is this: As I have listened to the discussion of the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Delaware, and my colleague, I have wondered, is it intended that there be an ironclad reduction in expenditures of at least \$1.9 billion below the amount recommended

to Congress in the views of President Nixon?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me answer the Senator's question this way: The President's revised budget estimates amount to \$192.9 billion.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of which, \$106.7 billion is in the uncontrollable category. That leaves \$86.2 billion in the controllable category.

We are simply saying here that the controllable \$86.2 billion will have to be cut by \$1.9 billion, bringing the controllable figure to \$84.3 billion. It is that simple.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I understand. However, as far as the controllable items, the Senator is insisting on an ironclad cut of \$1.9 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. As far as the uncontrollable items, it could wipe that out by \$2 billion, \$5 billion, or \$10 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As was the case in the fiscal year 1969 situation.

Mr. COOPER. There is no provision in the bill that would require this action. Assuming that the noncontrollable items were increased by \$5 billion or \$10 billion, there is no provision here that would require the President or Congress to reduce the controllable items by an amount sufficient to match the increased expenditures on uncontrollable items.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the whole argument basically gets down to the fact that last year the bill passed Congress and carried an exemption only as to interest on the national debt, which was really a fluctuating item.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Just a moment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. All right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then it spelled out that the trust fund payments, the social security payments, were not affected because the only way they could be changed up or down would be by congressional action raising or lowering the monthly payments. That is recognized. They were not affected.

The same thing is true on veterans' benefits mandatory under the law. We know they are obligations. We spell out exemptions for these.

However, beyond the trust funds and the veterans' payments and the interest, that was it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Would the Senator indulge a correction at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The unpredictable expenditures for Southeast Asia were also exempted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I was referring to domestic programs. Naturally, we cannot estimate any cost due to an acceleration of the war. However, I was speaking of the domestic programs first. However, those were items that we exempted in the original proposal that was sponsored by former Senator Smathers of Florida and me. I grant the Senator

that quite a few exemptions were approved later, although Congress did not make as many exemptions as are contained in the pending bill.

In all fairness, however, the TVA, which is not in the committee proposal, was exempted last year by the action of Congress. There may have been others.

I do not think there is anything new. This bill has far more exemptions now than Congress approved last year. This bill exempts the public assistance grants, including medicaid, farm price supports, and any prospective or future salary increases.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator indulge an interruption at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Last year, public assistance grants were included up to \$560 million over the budget estimate, and also farm price supports under the Commodity Credit Corporation were exempted up to \$907 million over the budget estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They were not exempted in the bill which we introduced in the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. They were added.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I grant the Senator that they were added later but over my objection. However, when they were later exempted it required affirmative action, debate, and a vote by Congress. That is what I would like to have done here with respect to whatever expenditure controls we enact now. I would like to have us at least firm the matter up, and then if Congress wants to stand by its decision it will have a chance to resist any later effort to amend the ceiling.

However, as I interpret the matter, if we pass the pending bill this will be the last chance we will have to look at it. Everything is automatic even on some of the items which are controllable.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is one of the advantages of the committee version.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. There is no question that from the standpoint of those who want no limit on spending this bill has a tremendous advantage.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, from the standpoint of those who want to know where we are and what action will be called for as a result, it is an advantage to Members of the Congress and the administration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is an advantage to those who want to increase spending. They would have the exemption already.

I think we would be making a terrible mistake if we were to approve the committee version. I will not say it is not worth the paper it is written on; however, as far as effective control on spending, in my opinion it is worthless. I would rather have no ceiling than for Congress to approve this farce.

Then the Senator could accept an amendment so as to tighten this down to the same restrictions we had last year when the bill was introduced in the Senate. If the Senate will accept that I

will go along with changing the figure from \$187.9 billion to \$190 billion; that is, with the exemptions the same as introduced last year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator begins with the item of unpredictable costs of Southeast Asia. That was in the Senator's bill last year. It is in the bill this year.

The next item is interest on the national debt. That was in the Senator's bill last year, and it is in the bill this year.

The next item is social security, including medicare. That item was in the Senator's bill last year, and it is in the pending bill.

The next item is veterans' pensions, medical care, and so forth. That item was in the Senator's bill last year, and it is in the pending bill.

The next item is farm price supports.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was not in my bill last year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me finish, please. The next item is farm price supports. That is in the pending bill, and it was in the Senator's bill after Congress had finished work on it, up to a point of \$907 million over the budget estimate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator talks about what Congress did before it got through. I will be honest with the Senator. There was not much left of the \$6 billion cut when Congress got through; however, we made an effort. I am speaking of the bill when it went through the Senate and not of the exemptions that were approved later.

In my opinion, Congress made a big mistake when it made the later exemptions last year. The best evidence of that can be seen when one looks at the inflationary spiral which constitutes a serious danger in our country today.

I think if we are going to have an expenditure ceiling we should have one that means something. I would be willing to accept the same exemptions we had last year when we considered my original bill. I would even accept a figure of \$190 billion if we can write that in and make it mandatory, with no loopholes or exemptions unless Congress and the Executive, working together, later change the figure.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator knows that if Congress made a mistake last year in exempting items, it will make the same mistake this year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why should we double it?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do not know. The Senator can answer that question. However, he will agree that Congress will make the same exemptions this year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will not agree with that, I hope that Congress realizes the dangerous results of its actions of last year. When we figure that today money is around 8 percent, and I notice in the paper today that they are predicting a triple A bond being released today or tomorrow with an 8-percent coupon rate and the Government of the United States paying around 7-percent interest. Certainly Congress is more alert to the dangers today; if not, then we had better get another Congress.

I do not think our Government can continue to neglect this inflationary spiral. I think we can do something, and I do not think that raising taxes is enough. We must cut spending.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then let us put an effective ceiling on expenditures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I agree.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is much easier to operate with a pocketful of money and no control over spending. It is much easier as an individual to go downtown with a pocketful of money. However, our Government has reached the point where it does not have the money to pay our bills without borrowing.

I hope that the Senator will go along with eliminating from the excepted list the open-end items on page 16.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We had more than three items last year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Southeast Asia items on page 27.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me ask the Senator this: Would the Senator like to remove from the exemptions the item of \$25.2 billion for expenditures for Southeast Asia?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think we have any choice; and that was exempted last year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Would the Senator like to remove that item from the exemptions?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. It was in last year when we introduced the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Would the Senator like to remove from the exemptions the \$42.1 billion for social security and medicare?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have said that I will take the bill we had last year if the Senator will support it, and I will offer it as a substitute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Would the Senator like to remove from the exemptions the \$16.4 billion for interest rates on the national debt?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is listed as \$16 billion on page 16 of the budget.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is \$16.4 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was in the exemptions last year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So the Senator would like to remove it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. What is this, shadow boxing?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Would the Senator like to remove from the exemptions the \$6.1 billion for veterans' pensions, veterans' compensation, and medical care?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have already said that that was in the bill last year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Would the Senator like to remove from the exemptions the \$7.2 billion for public assistance grants, including medicaid?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was not in our bill, and they are controllable items.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator would like to exempt that?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. They can be controlled.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Then, I suggest that the Senator offer an amendment, and let us have a vote on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do not worry, an amendment will be offered if that is what the Senator wants.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do not want it. That is what the Senator from Delaware wants.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why should we have an exemption for the postal operations? Why should we exempt Congress from some controls when we are asking other agencies to accept controls? Why should we ask all these executive departments to control spending but say that Congress is not going to be controlled? I would not exempt the judiciary. Then there is the item of \$1.5 billion classified as "other."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, it is \$2.1 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It has jumped \$500 million in the last 3 months.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It has jumped \$0.6 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps it has jumped another hundred million dollars since we began debating.

I would strike out, that exemption. I just do not understand what it is. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and then we will start on the amendments.

I will withhold that. Does the Senator wish to speak first?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold that, temporarily.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the committee has attempted to substitute an approach—which we think is workable, which will give the President of the United States some flexibility, and which will require a reduction of \$1.9 billion in the controllable expenses—for an approach which was suggested by the House and which is considered by the committee to be unworkable, overly restrictive, and uncertain and indefinite in its results.

The provision enacted by the House would utilize the President's revised budget estimate of \$192.9 billion as a ceiling, a ceiling which could be increased or decreased only by action or inaction of Congress. The President could do nothing to raise or lower that ceiling.

An example of action by Congress would be in the case of increasing the appropriation, let us say, for flood-control projects by \$100 million over the budget estimate. That would automatically raise the ceiling from \$192.9 billion to \$193 billion.

An example of inaction by Congress which would have an impact upon that ceiling would be if Congress fails to enact legislation making the postal increases requested by the President. If Congress refuses to enact those postal increases, there would be an automatic increase in the ceiling of \$192.9 billion by \$621 million. That is an example of inaction by the Congress and its impact on the ceiling.

Congress would not determine the expenditure impact of its increases or decreases in appropriations. This would have to be done, under the House provision, by the Bureau of the Budget, which every month for the remainder of this calendar year would have to report to

Congress the impact of its appropriations on expenditures. Then, during the last half of the fiscal year, the impact would be reported by the Bureau of the Budget once every quarter. But the provision that has been enacted by the House makes no exemptions whatsoever, no exceptions for increases in uncontrollable items, and it would require the President to make corresponding decreases in controllable items for any unanticipated increases in the uncontrollable items. It simply states a ceiling, makes no exemptions, and says this is it.

For example, if the war in South Vietnam were to heat up, let us say, next March, and the President had to request from Congress \$2 billion in additional moneys for Southeast Asia, this would be a request by the President; it would not be action by Congress. If Congress allowed the \$2 billion, this would not have any effect on the ceiling, because the President would have requested it, and the ceiling can be adjusted only by congressional action or inaction. So the ceiling would remain the same, at \$192.9 billion, even though the President requested from Congress a \$2 billion additional appropriation for Southeast Asia. Now, if \$1 billion of that \$2 billion were to be expended in fiscal year 1970, this would mean the President would have to make a corresponding decrease of \$1 billion in controllable items as late as next April or May under the example I have cited.

The committee felt that this is too restrictive. It would straitjacket the President, and it really seems unworkable. So the committee sought to come to the floor with a provision that would require a reduction in expenditures but which would take into account and exempt the unpredictable item of Southeast Asia, fixed items such as the interest rate, and open ended items such as public assistance, and so forth. It has, therefore, exempted those so-called uncontrollables, but it does require the President or Congress to make a reduction in the controllable items in an amount not less than \$1.9 billion. So this assures a cut of at least \$1.9 billion. If Congress makes the cut, then the President does not have to make a reduction. But \$1.9 billion is a pretty sizable cut in expenditures.

In 1968, Congress made appropriations cuts amounting to \$5,567 million, whereas the expenditure impact from those cuts was only \$1,907 million. In 1969, Congress made appropriations cuts amounting to \$13,188 million. Yet the total expenditure impact was only \$3,803 million. So the expenditure impact was approximately only one-third, or less than one-third, of the total appropriations cuts made by Congress.

So when we require an expenditure cut of \$1.9 billion, we are really talking about a \$5.5 billion to a \$6.5 billion cut in appropriations. And that isn't chicken-feed in anybody's language. The \$1.9 billion cut, when added to the \$4 billion reduction that the President has already made in the Johnson budget, makes a total reduction from the Johnson budget of approximately \$5.9 billion, which is about the size of the \$6 billion cut required by the Congress last year.

So, Mr. President, I hope that the Senator will go along with the committee version, because it does insure a cut in Federal expenditures; it does exempt those areas of the budget over which the President and Congress have virtually no control. At the same time, it puts the President on notice now as to the minimum reduction to be made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has a statement he wishes to make on another matter, and we can resume our debate later.

However, I wish to say to the Senator that I will propose amendments. I want to make sure that any ceiling enacted will be effective.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The bill clearly states that there must be a reduction of \$1.9 billion in these controllable items and that is as plain as one can make it. If that language becomes the law we will have to abide by it.

I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for yielding.

Mr. President, I would like to point out that the inclusion of \$18,736,000 in this bill for the District of Columbia subway system represents a real breakthrough. In my years in the other body, as well as here, I have been fighting this battle, and I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, because I think this item is an example of the constructive leadership that the Senator has exercised. I wish to thank him for it.

Approval of these funds will permit the Metropolitan Washington Transit Authority to start construction of the subway system, a system which is absolutely essential to meeting the transportation needs of this rapidly-growing area.

In line with the colloquy which has taken place between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Delaware, longer postponements could greatly increase overall construction costs, which are now increasing as much as \$250,000 per day. More seriously,

I am delighted that these funds have been included in this bill, because further delay could have disastrous results. First, longer postponements could greatly increase overall construction costs, which are now increasing as much as \$250,000 per day. More seriously, longer delay could jeopardize the complicated and somewhat delicate structure of regional accords and financial commitments which have been so laboriously shaped by all the governments in the metropolitan area.

It is only realistic, however, to add a cautionary note. However much we may regret it, the fact is that the metro system cannot be considered or constructed without some regard for the progress of the area's freeway system. To be blunt, the subway has to date been held hostage for the freeway system, particularly for the Three Sisters Bridge. Therefore, the

freeway controversy—incredibly tangled as it is—simply must be resolved in order to assure, first, that subway construction will continue on schedule, and second, that rational transportation planning for the entire metropolitan region can be advanced.

I was very pleased to see that the Secretary of Transportation has taken a personal interest in the problem and has indicated that he intends to press for a reasonable solution.

It would be most encouraging and timely to have the same types of assurances now from the District of Columbia government, including both the Mayor and the city council. I hope both Mayor Washington and Chairman Hahn will give us that kind of assurance.

What we need now from all parties, and I emphasize "all parties," is not stubbornness, but statesmanship. A problem of this magnitude and intricacy can be resolved only by the persistently exercising of the art of compromise. I think the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has given us an example of that.

To assure that the \$18.7 million will actually be approved, I would urge all parties concerned to reconsider their individual positions, weigh carefully the possible price of further deadlock, and actively seek the areas of agreement on which a sensible transportation policy could be based.

If they have any doubt about the urgency of it they do not have to look at statistics; they merely have to try to get downtown in the early morning.

I trust that this course of seeking compromise will be productive. If necessary, I intend to make specific recommendations myself during the coming weeks.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not call up my amendment with relation to summer jobs for youth for a little while. However, I wish to comment on another matter regarding this bill.

I am particularly heartened to note that the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to restore the \$16 million cut earlier this year from the educational opportunity grant program authorized by title IV-A of the Higher Education Act.

Under this program grants of from \$200 to \$1,000 are awarded to qualified students of exceptional financial need who, without this assistance would be unable to attend college. The amount awarded must be matched by funds from other sources such as institutional aid, student loans, and earnings from work-study employment.

I hope that our colleagues in the other body on the conference committee will agree to the wisdom of this restoration of funds, which offers such great hope to promising young Americans who other-

wise would not be able to obtain a higher education. At a time when tuition costs are rising at a rate of between 5 percent and 10 percent annually, when other costs are rising and when obtaining a guaranteed student loan is more difficult because of the tight money market and high interest rates, the importance of the EOG program and its maintenance become more apparent.

As to how this \$16 million restoration will affect one State, let me cite the example of New York, where \$1.23 million in new funds for initial EOG awards would likely be made available to the colleges in the State. Of this amount, \$270,000 would be assigned to the 25 State-operated campuses of the State University of New York—SUNY—increasing its available initial year funds by 30 percent, to \$1.2 million. Thus some 305 new eligible students could be enrolled at SUNY's colleges in September in addition to the 1,100 for whom funds are presently available. The families of most of these 1,450 young people have gross incomes below \$3,000—none exceed \$6,000.

I should like to emphasize that none of these promising students will have to be sought out when this appropriation becomes a reality. They are now awaiting fulfillment of the pledge made them by SUNY in partnership with the Government based on the intent and authorization of the Higher Education Act, as amended last year. These Federal moneys are a vital addition to the \$4 million being expended by the State for its own program, SEEK, which is similar to EOG in purpose.

In conclusion, I should like to commend the committee for this restoration of funds to EOG and assure its members that they have my support in conference to sustain the provision.

I feel an additional sense of strength because of that and urge upon the Congress the final enactment of this restoration which has been made so intelligently. I am happy to say to my friend, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), by the Appropriations Committee.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IT IS URGENT THAT MIRV FLIGHT TESTS BE HALTED

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a matter that is fully as urgent to the best interests of the United States as the contents of the bill that is now before the Senate.

I speak of the need to open talks with the Soviet Union on a strategic arms limitation treaty, and of the threat to those talks that is implicit in the continued testing of multiple warheads by both nations.

The press today reports that the administration has proposed that the talks between the two countries start on July 31, some 6 weeks from now. If true, this is indeed good news to all of us who have deplored the months long delay in getting talks started.

But the press has also reported no change in the administration's intention to continue flight tests of multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles—or MIRV's—even after the talks open. And that is indeed bad news.

For the simple fact is that nothing is so certain to insure that the strategic arms race continues on an upward spiral as is the deployment of MIRV's.

Today, thanks to independent surveillance systems, both sides can count the other's offensive missiles and estimate with some assurance the damage they might do.

But once these missiles can be fitted with multiple warheads, and especially MIRV's, such assurance will not be possible.

The urgency of the matter rests on the fact that the only real hope of avoiding the deployment of MIRV warheads by both sides is to ban the testing of MIRV's before they have been fully developed by either side. And that moment is rapidly approaching.

Indeed, when I first raised this question with Secretary Laird when he appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee almost 3 months ago, he said we would be deploying MIRV's "not in the too distant future."

The United States has already conducted quite a number of MIRV flight tests with Poseidon and Minuteman III missiles. The Soviet Union has also conducted flight tests of multiple warheads in the Pacific.

Whether they are testing true MIRV's or simpler MIRV—that is to say, multiple reentry vehicles without independent guidance—is a matter of some dispute in the intelligence community.

Only a week ago Friday, for example, when asked if the Soviets were flight testing MIRV's, Secretary Rogers told members of the Foreign Relations Committee, "I have no reason to think they are."

Then last Monday the Times reported that "intelligence experts in the Pentagon" have concluded that the Soviets are testing true MIRV's. This obviously inspired report has also appeared in other publications.

But whether the Soviets are testing MIRV's or simply MVR's is beside the point. For it is undisputed that the United States is substantially ahead of the Soviets in MIRV technology. Nor can anyone argue that a mutual moratorium on flight tests would enable the Soviets to overcome our lead.

More importantly, I know of no one who is prepared to dispute the proposition that, once MIRV's are fully tested by either or both sides, there would be no way of checking on compliance with an agreement not to deploy MIRV's except by detailed, on-site inspections which the Soviet Union would never agree to and we would not be likely to agree to either.

The importance of immediate action

to stop MIRV flight tests now—before they have been completed by either side—cannot, therefore, be overestimated. Upon taking this action now may well depend the possibility of any effective limitation of strategic armaments by agreement between our country and the Soviet Union.

Three weeks ago I called on President Nixon to order an immediate halt to MIRV flight tests for so long as the Soviets did the same.

I made that proposal in full confidence that such an initiative on our part would entail no risk to our security:

We are substantially ahead of the Soviets in MIRV technology.

We can monitor their flight tests—as they can monitor ours. If they resume tests, we will know.

We can maintain our readiness to resume testing, as we must assume the Soviets would also do.

We can resume tests immediately should they decide to do so. Obviously, this proposal is not unilateral disarmament in any sense.

The Senate will recall that just over 10 years ago—on October 31, 1958—President Eisenhower announced that the United States would conduct no further tests of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere for so long as the Soviets did likewise.

The Soviets observed that moratorium for 3 years, until September 1, 1961, when they resumed testing. The United States then conducted further tests of its own. But the moratorium, even though broken, helped to pave the way for the partial Test Ban Treaty of 1963, which the Senate ratified by a vote of 80 to 19.

If we are ever to conclude a strategic arms limitation treaty with the Soviet Union, the terms of that agreement must be such that the President, the Senate, and the American people can be confident of our ability to detect violations that might jeopardize our safety.

We can have no such confidence once the Soviets have fully tested MIRV warheads. Nor could they have any such confidence once we have reached that stage.

Indeed, there is good reason to believe that somewhere short of full testing, both nations would have to conclude that it was too late to enter a moratorium on testing with sufficient assurance that the other side could not deploy.

Would the Soviets respond in kind to the initiative I am proposing, and thus bring about an effective if informal moratorium on MIRV testing?

No one can say. But what I can and do say with absolute conviction is this: If we allow this momentary opportunity to stay the mad momentum of nuclear armaments to slip by, the security that this Government is sworn to seek and maintain for our Nations will not grow, but will diminish.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I associate myself with all that has been said by the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey. I commend him for taking this position on this most vital subject,

Once either side is satisfied that it has tested enough, or once either side fears that the other side has tested enough, we have gone beyond the point of no return. That is why it is so urgent that all strength possible be brought behind the effort now to stop MIRV, before weeks, let alone months, have passed and that danger point is suddenly behind us.

With respect to the remarks made by the Senator from Arizona, I totally agree with him in his basic point that we should not stop MIRV if the Soviet Union does not stop MIRV. The resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts takes that point fully into account and takes into account that present abilities to inspect—not including on-the-spot inspection—enable us and—enable the other side to know whether or not there are experimentations with this device; and so each side could automatically and instantly detect a violation of a stand-still agreement if this resolution were adopted and a stand-still agreement was accepted by both sides.

Finally, let me say, from this side of the aisle, that I think a great contribution has been made to the cause of peace by the fact that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), on the other side of the aisle, has provided the great leadership he has provided in the ABM fight, and he recognizes the interlocking nature of the MIRV and ABM. This, together with the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from New Jersey, again on the other side of the aisle, have provided such inspiring and effective leadership in the MIRV battle, along with the ABM battle, bodes well for our country. When we can have this sort of leadership within that party, matched, I hope, by effective leadership on this side of the aisle, I think we have rising hopes that we can make a breakthrough in the cause of peace.

Mr. CASE. I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. BROOKE. I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

I should like to say that he is providing distinguished leadership on that side of the aisle, and we are very grateful for having his association with the sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for yielding in order that I can pay tribute to his leadership and to his objectivity in bringing this subject to the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

As the Senator knows, I am very much in sympathy with his views. I hope to join with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in the resolution to be offered on the subject of MIRV.

I should like to make one cautionary point. There has been a good deal of discussion this afternoon about ABM's; and my own position on ABMs has been a matter of public record for over a year, since we had to vote on this matter in the other body, of which I was then a Member. I have stated here my views—they are in sympathy with those of the Senator—on the question of MIRV.

I hope that we will set this entire discussion—as I am sure those of us who are here today do set it—in its proper context. But I think we should make it clear, not only for those who are in the Senate today but also for all others who may have some interest in these proceedings—that we are discussing not just certain things, certain new instruments of mass destruction, certain new weapons.

We should make it clear that we are not falling for a new recipe of the Washington alphabet soup; that we are talking about an entirely new generation of armament; and that as we discuss these individual items of armament—offensive and theoretically defensive—we are contemplating the fact that the world is threatened with a whole new generation of armament, a new generation of armament that a crowded world and a hungry world can not afford and will not tolerate.

It is for this reason that I am extremely grateful to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for the leadership they have shown. Unless we can take hold of the objective points in such a vast and complex question as this—and we have taken hold of them—I think it makes it very hard for Congress and for the country to grasp the implications, and I appreciate what the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Massachusetts are doing.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Maryland. I thank him not only for joining us in general support of our objective, but also for the particular contribution he has just made in regard to this matter as an element in the escalation of the arms race.

The arms race will go from level to level, ever higher in escalation, unless it is stopped by verifiable agreements. This matter is important further for two reasons: In itself as an escalation of the arms race and, most important, as an element, depending on how we deal with it, which will have perhaps crucial importance upon the possibility of securing verifiable arms reduction agreements.

I thank the Senator.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I support the committee amendment to restore the \$16 million which was cut from the educational opportunity grants program last summer. I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for including this item in the supplemental bill. It has grieved me to see a program with a so noble a purpose as this, one which seeks through education to promote equality of opportunity in this country, stymied through a lack of funds. I think that this is a commitment we should keep. Congress should cease playing a game of cat-and-mouse with the young people from disadvantaged backgrounds whom this program is designed to serve.

At the outset, it was envisioned that the EOG program would enjoy a steady rise, enabling a gradually increasing number of disadvantaged students to attend college. This would be part of our attack on poverty, and it would attempt a cure at the roots—lack of education and training for fruitful lifetime employment. It has long been recognized that there is a great deal of talent wasted in this country due to lack of opportunity to exercise it.

College is expensive. Even a relatively inexpensive college is expensive, for it means, to begin with, the short run sacrifice of income. For the child of a family which can shoulder little of the financial burden of college expenses, the educational opportunity grants can add the margin of help that makes it possible for a student to attend college, pay the tuition, buy the books, and cover the personal expenses which are involved. For disadvantaged students, the colleges can use a combination of work-study, individual earnings, and loans, and fill the gap with an EOG.

When appropriations for EOG's were cut by \$16 million last fall, college opportunity was denied to some 32,000 aspiring students. This is the approximate number to whom the colleges would have to deny aid because of the reduced appropriations, and these are the very students who have the fewest alternatives for financing a college education. For California residents the number denied would be about 4,040 disadvantaged students.

Even the 2-year community colleges, which are among the Nation's best educational bargain, will have to cut back their services to disadvantaged students. California has a vigorous community college system. Many of these colleges are doing yeoman work in the education of the disadvantaged in their areas, and their reports to me indicate that they are hurting. Here is the complaint from the San Mateo Junior College district, which enrolls 1,300 minority students, many of whom need financial aid:

One of the serious problems that has led to alienation and to campus disruption has been our inability to provide adequate financial aid for our students from homes of low family income . . . We know that innovative programs like ours, coupled with appropriate student financial aids, can equalize opportunity and minimize campus tensions.

From the San Jose City College comes this report:

We have a substantial number of minority students who attend our college and we are desperately in need of funds to maintain adequate programs . . . The Student Financial Aids Program for 1969-70 at San Jose City College has been drastically affected by the curtailment of funds from the Federal Government. We will receive approximately forty per cent of the funds requested from each of three programs—NDSL, EOG, and Work-Study. What this means is that awards to students in need of financial assistance will either have to be reduced below the level students will need to meet their educational expenses, or reductions will have to be made in the number of students whose low incomes qualify them for financial help.

Mr. President, I hope these examples will illustrate why I believe that it is urgent that we vote to restore no less

than \$16 million to the EOG appropriations for 1969. I do not believe that colleges should be hampered in their efforts to equalize educational opportunity by an unpredictable Congress. A program like this requires funding close to the authorization level if it is to do the job it was designed to do. And in this case it is a vitally important job which will be critical for years to come.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I am extremely delighted that the Committee on Appropriations has restored \$16 million in funds for the educational opportunity grants program in the second supplemental appropriation bill now pending before the Senate. As I indicated in a letter to the committee urging that this action be taken, about 32,000 low-income and disadvantaged students will be able to take part in this program next September should these funds be appropriated now.

The educational opportunity grants program has been a successful and effective way of making the benefits of higher education available to qualified high school graduates of exceptional financial need who, without this aid, would otherwise be unable to obtain these benefits. It is vitally important that we continue to support programs of this kind to the fullest extent possible.

The restoration of full funding for the EOG program is significant from another point of view. We have passed programs in the Congress to identify and encourage needy students to continue their education beyond secondary school. In order for these programs to succeed, we must have the requisite financial assistance available for those students whose potential we are attempting to develop. It is simply inconsistent to encourage a needy child to better himself through higher education, and then have to tell him that we cannot help him out when he gets to college.

I hope that when this issue is discussed in conference, the conferees will agree upon the necessity for a full restoration of \$16 million in funds for this program. Congress has shown its interest in developing the untapped potential of our disadvantaged youth. We cannot fail to carry through in our commitment.

Mr. President, as an excellent example of the immediate impact of these funds, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Samuel B. Gould, chancellor of the State University of New York, outlining the possible effect of this funding restoration upon the 63 campuses of the State University of New York.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
Albany, N.Y., June 11, 1969.

HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GOODELL: I urge you to support current Senate efforts to add to the sup-

plemental appropriation bill in the amount of \$16 million to make the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) program available to many more of the prospective low income and disadvantaged students. In support of this effort, I would like to offer some indication of the extent to which such action will increase our ability to offer opportunity to these students at the 63 campuses of the State University of New York.

Of the approximately \$1,230,000 in new funds for initial EOG awards which are likely to be made available to all colleges in New York State from a \$16 million appropriation, about \$270,000 would be assigned to the 25 State-operated campuses of the University. This would increase State University's available initial year funds by thirty percent, to \$1,200,000.

Some 350 new EOG eligible students could be enrolled at SUNY's colleges in September in addition to the 1,100 for whom funds are presently available. The families of most of these 1,450 students have gross incomes below \$3,000; none exceed \$6,000.

It is important to understand that none of these young people will have to be sought out once the proposed appropriation becomes a reality. We now know who they are. They are waiting for us to fulfill the promise we made to them in partnership with the government based on the intent and authorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as recently amended. At least another 1,500 whose expectations have similarly been raised by this action of the Federal Government are waiting to hear from us.

Our community colleges could, collectively, expect at least an additional \$300,000 from a supplemental budget you propose. This would bring their available grant funds to about \$1,500,000. The number of students who could be offered this opportunity would increase from about 1,800 to approximately 2,400. These additional 600 students represent only part of the community college waiting list. Many additional students eligible and waiting for EOG support may have to be turned away by community colleges this fall.

Thus, for the entire State University, including the community colleges, the net increase in students who could be assisted by the supplemental appropriation would be close to 1,000.

State University with the support of New York State is trying to do its part in offering opportunity to the type of student the Educational Opportunity Grant was intended to assist. Our State University SEEK program alone of about \$4 million is ready to provide the supportive educational and other assistance to these students. If the present low level of Federal EOG support should continue, we may have to redirect some of the SEEK funds from the educational programs where it is most urgently needed to the kind of direct financial aid that these students require. I strongly believe this is poor policy and the wrong use of resources. In addition, such action will create a dilemma that neither students nor college administrators should have to face.

The proposed supplemental appropriation is urgently needed now, and I would appreciate your willingness to give this measure your fullest support.

Sincerely,

SAMUEL B. GOULD.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in light of the situation which we now see at the end of the day, it is unlikely that the amendment I have submitted, to increase the supplemental amount available to the Neighborhood Youth Corps to \$55 million, can be considered tonight.

I shall offer this amendment tomorrow, with the support of a number of Senators. However there are some remarks which Senators might find useful to have in the RECORD, together with a letter from the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and a schedule showing precisely why at least \$55 million is necessary.

I might say preliminarily that this amount was proposed to the Appropriations Committee. I wish to express my gratitude to the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE)—and I believe that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) was also of considerable help in the Appropriations Committee—for putting the matter before that committee and for being successful to the extent of \$7½ million, which was not in the bill, and which represents an amount which even the Labor Department agrees we need and can be very fruitfully and effectively spent.

Because I think it is critically important, I would first express by thanks and appreciation for that, and explain to Senator CASE that I would not have offered this amendment at all were it not for the very strong support coming from the U.S. Conference of Mayors. If we expect to cool off what could be a very hot summer, I feel that we had better listen to them and Senators from States with big cities and smaller communities with similar needs should at least hear the argument and look at the figures and have an opportunity to vote on the needed amount, according to the Conference of Mayors, rather than just letting it go by default.

This does not take one thing away from the magnificent service—and the country should be very grateful—rendered by Senator CASE and Senator PASTORE in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

I thoroughly sympathize with him. In fact, as he has said, I did offer his amendment in the Appropriations Committee. I think the reason for it is obvious. I believe that the U.S. Conference of Mayors is the body most able to tell us what is necessary. Based upon the estimates from my own State, I know that the amount that would be provided by the Senator's amendment is by no means too generous.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the amendment will be cosponsored by me, together with the Senator from Wisconsin and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment Manpower and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG).

It would provide an additional \$55 million under the Manpower Development and Training Act for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program for the coming months.

The summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program was developed to enable disadvantaged youths to earn money during the period when they tend to disassociate themselves from school and are most subject to pressures to leave school. Programs are administered on the local level by public or nonprofit "sponsors." On the national level, administration is the responsibility of the Department of Labor, pursuant to a delegation from the Office of Economic Opportunity. This summer the Department has stipulated that each sponsor must hire an independent accountant to certify proper handling and recording of funds. That should avoid some things we have run into in other summers, when we had irresponsible handling of accounting and bookkeeping details in some instances.

The Department of Labor has advised that 1,530,000 youths 14 to 21 years of age will be unemployed and eligible for Neighborhood Youth Corps summer programs this summer. Yet, without a supplemental the allocation for the summer will provide only 336,000 slots, the same number as last year. Thus, despite initial appropriations and the recent reallocation by the administration, the vast majority of our eligible disadvantaged youths will have no choice but to spend the summer months on our cities' streets rather than in meaningful employment.

We know that at this date there is a difference between the number of Neighborhood Youth Corps slots which is needed and the number which can be effectively utilized by the Federal, State, and local officials involved in this essential program. Accordingly, I recently requested that the Conference of Mayors poll their cities to determine how many additional slots could be beneficially used during the coming weeks. On the basis of reports confirmed on June 5, 1969, the Conference has advised that 72,382 slots can still be effectively used in our 50 major cities. For example, New York City falls 21,621 slots short of its needs; Chicago needs an additional 8,846 slots; Los Angeles, 2,401 slots; Detroit 2,422 slots; Baltimore, 2,363 slots; Cleveland, 2,822 slots; San Francisco, 642 slots; Boston, 314 slots; and Pittsburgh, 412 slots.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a chart prepared for me by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, dealing with the 50 largest cities and showing their needs at 72,382 job slots for the summer, giving the figures according to the present allocation, comparing them with 1968, and showing what is required for each of the 50 larger cities.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS SUMMER PROGRAMS, 50 LARGEST CITIES, 1968 AND 1969—ENROLLMENT LEVELS

City	Summer, 1968			Summer, 1969			
	EOA	MDTA	Total	Original allocation	Additional slots added by reallocation	Total, all sources	Additional required
Akron	350	150	500	350	165	515	97
Atlanta	1,292	500	1,792	1,292	555	1,847	420
Baltimore	4,000	500	4,500	4,000	637	4,637	2,363
Birmingham	790	150	940	790	179	969	421
Boston	1,300		1,300	1,200	186	1,386	814
Buffalo	1,645	500	2,145	1,645	565	2,210	635
Chicago	18,500	3,000	21,500	18,500	3,654	22,154	8,846
Cincinnati	1,204	75	1,279	1,110	208	1,318	617
Cleveland	3,900		3,900	3,900	118	4,018	2,882
Columbus	625		625	625	19	644	456
Dade County (Miami)	1,250	350	1,600	1,150	499	1,649	501
Dallas	820	175	995	920	105	1,025	495
Dayton	420	100	520	420	116	536	84
Denver	450	100	550	450	117	567	233
Detroit	5,000	200	5,200	4,780	578	5,358	2,422
El Paso	398	300	698	398	321	719	0
Fort Worth	465	35	500	465	50	515	270
Gary	780	200	980	780	230	1,010	370
Honolulu	836	138	974	836	167	1,003	458
Houston	1,622	200	1,822	1,622	255	1,877	970
Indianapolis	400		400	350	62	412	238
Jersey City	750	114	864	750	140	890	385
Kansas City, Mo.	798	300	1,098	800	331	1,131	269
Los Angeles (including Long Beach)	8,829	1,291	10,120	8,828	1,599	10,427	2,401
Louisville	1,380		1,380	1,480	45	1,525	1,080
Memphis	850	240	1,090	850	273	1,123	377
Milwaukee	1,100	407	1,507	1,100	453	1,553	372
Minneapolis	1,000	205	1,205	1,000	242	1,242	508
Newark	2,380	228	2,608	2,380	307	2,687	1,493
New Orleans	990	200	1,190	990	236	1,226	7,264
New York	23,900	3,640	27,540	23,900	4,479	28,379	21,621
Norfolk	1,000	100	1,100	1,000	134	1,134	616
Oakland	2,207	341	2,548	2,207	418	2,625	1,232
Oklahoma City	720	125	845	720	151	871	388
Omaha	830	400	1,230	830	427	1,257	188
Philadelphia	2,790	280	3,070	2,305	858	3,163	942
Phoenix	1,137	520	1,657	1,885	57	1,942	1,343
Pittsburgh	3,100	300	3,400	3,165	338	3,503	412
Portland, Oreg.	510	65	575	616	19	635	431
Rochester	733		733	700	64	764	461
St. Louis	1,080	700	1,780	1,080	754	1,834	0
St. Paul	300	363	663	300	383	683	0
San Antonio	2,140	100	2,240	2,142	166	2,308	1,434
San Diego	1,539	213	1,752	1,539	266	1,805	884
San Francisco	1,525	400	1,925	1,525	458	1,983	642
Seattle	800	375	1,175	846	365	1,211	285
Tampa	1,100	200	1,300	1,100	239	1,339	586
Toledo	400	200	600	400	218	618	82
Tulsa	240	100	340	240	111	351	69
Washington, D.C.	7,520	1,982	9,502	7,305	2,486	9,791	3,014
Total	117,695	20,062	137,757	117,566	24,813	142,379	72,382

Note: All figures except last column supplied by Department of Labor; last column supplied by U.S. Conference of Mayors.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we need not look merely to our 50 largest cities to find tension, discontent, and the need for additional opportunities for our disadvantaged youths. The Conference of Mayors advises that 67,313 slots can still be effectively utilized in hundreds of smaller cities which have sponsors for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer programs. For example, Little Rock, Ark. is 600 slots short; Lexington, Ky., 150; Birmingham, Ala., 100; Orlando, Fla., 500; Fort Lauderdale, Fla., 100; and Compton, Calif., 200.

An opportunity for one youth in the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer programs costs approximately \$411. To provide opportunities for the 72,382 youths in our 50 largest cities and for the 67,313 youths in our smaller cities who can still benefit from a summer job, will require an additional appropriation of an amount in excess of \$55 million. As reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, a supplemental of only \$7,500,000 will be available, an amount based upon only a preliminary report from the regional offices of the Department of Labor.

As I said when I began, I respectfully submit that the situation is such, and the premium on having peace in our cities is so great, that I feel in all fairness the Senate should have an opportunity to vote upon the amount which the mayors think they need, considering the tremendous budgetary strains under which our Government departments are now laboring and the tremendous pressures on them to bring everything down to the barest minimum without real concern for the priorities involved.

The overall situation for this summer has been aggravated by the effect of certain decisions by the Department of Labor. I have made it quite clear in previous statements that the Department should be given the chance to redefine the "mix" of training opportunities available to our young people and I have every reason to believe that the administration is acting in good faith and that, in the end, the administration will provide expanded and more relevant opportunities.

But despite the Department's best efforts, the summer has arrived before

those ambitious and well-intended plans can be culminated. Thousands of youths who were in Job Corps centers designated for closing have chosen not to accept transfer to other centers and have returned to the cities, still awaiting assignment to other manpower programs. The Secretary recently reported that as of May 24, 1969, only 225 of over 3,000 enrollees who had returned to their homes from Job Corps centers have actually been enrolled in other programs. In addition, the Department is making efforts to locate more than 1,100 dropouts who, once located, should be provided summer jobs. The Secretary has also indicated that more than 9,000 youths who had been accepted or had applied for Job Corps have been delayed entry and many may not be assigned to centers until as late as August or September because of a recruiting freeze instituted by the Department of Labor as a part of the phaseout.

We must make available Neighborhood Youth Corps slots for those youths who are caught in the uncertainties imposed by the transition between the elimination of almost half of the Job Corps centers and the implementation of new plans for an expanded and improved manpower training program.

Mr. President, we have been telling this Nation's disadvantaged over and over again that the road out of poverty is traveled by those who are willing to work. If we let an additional 136,500 youths 14 to 21 years of age spend this summer in idleness, how can we be assured that they will not spend the rest of their lives on welfare rolls? To fail to provide these slots is to miss an opportunity to let disadvantaged youngsters learn from their own experience that it means something to have a job.

Is \$55 million too high a price to pay? How much is \$55 million? Mr. President, colleagues, \$55 million can buy more than 136,500 meaningful opportunities for youth or it can buy 200 tanks. Putting it another way, the recently announced cost overrun on the Minuteman missile would provide the number of job slots which we seek to add for this summer for every summer for the next 70 years.

Mr. President, I do not use those figures to denigrate what we do in defense or the provisions which are made to secure the hardware for our Armed Forces. I only point out that from the facts involved, considering the order of magnitude of the appropriations with which we deal, the amount of \$55 million is not very large. A critical situation faces this country again this summer, as is wisely recognized through the Nation. Therefore, the price—if it may be deemed that—which we pay for an added measure of domestic security cannot begin to be compared to the amounts we spend unhesitatingly in the military field.

Mr. President, I, and many others, have fought hard for a rearrangement of our national priorities, within reason. I have talked about the overall figure of \$5 billion as a figure which needs to be reoriented to the uses of the war on poverty, on rural poverty, as well as on urban poverty, and the other deep, social ills which assail our country today.

The sum of \$55 million is of an emergency character. It is for summer jobs for the most volatile element of our population. This is simply an effort to rearrange our national priorities more in keeping with the aggregate of our national problems than, seemingly, has come out of the administration.

Mr. President, I would not have made this amendment without the support of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and their express statement that it is what is urgently required by those men to whom we will be looking to keep their cities "cool" throughout the summer. If we expect them to do that—and we do—we had better give them some tools to work with. This is what it takes.

The amount involved is so disproportionate to the issue involved, and so well within the capability of every budget, whatever freeze we may place upon it, that I respectfully submit that the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text thereof be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with a number of documents which establish the need which this amendment seeks to fill.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 5, 1969.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This is in response to the joint inquiry you and Senators Nelson and Cranston made concerning Job Corps enrollees at the centers to be closed.

The data we have reflects what has happened at the centers as of May 30 and at the local employment offices in the home areas of the enrollees as of May 23 except for 16 States where the latest information is as of May 10. These data are obtained each week and we can provide more up-to-date information as it is received and processed.

The status of the 16,536 enrollees at the centers to be closed April 11, including some 264 that arrived at the centers since that date, is as follows:

1. *Transfers to other Job Corps centers.* 4,700 have been transferred to other Job Corps centers. Another 1,100 are still in the centers to be closed and have been scheduled to be transferred to other centers. According to Job Corps officials handling the transfers, 97 percent of the women's and 100 percent of the men's urban center enrollees have been placed in the same program or in courses closely related to the skill training they were receiving in the centers that are being closed. The training program in the conservation centers is standard so that all conservation center enrollees transferring to other centers were able to continue their program without interruption.

2. *Placement in other manpower training programs.* As of May 30, employment service interviewers have referred 600 enrollees to training programs directly from the centers. About 85 percent were referred to MDTA projects, the remainder to NYC projects. We do not have data at this time to indicate how many have actually started their new program.

As of May 24, 3,000 enrollees had returned to their homes for placement assistance. Employment service interviewers at the local offices in the enrollees home towns have referred about 700 enrollees to training. Of this

number 225 have been enrolled in a program with the remainder waiting for the courses to start. The types of programs are as follows:

	Referred	Enrolled
NAB, JOBS.....	82	42
MDTA, institutional.....	124	52
MDTA, OJT.....	17	0
NYC.....	223	83
Other.....	248	48
Total.....	694	225

There were about 500 ex-corpsmen who had been placed in an assessment program and were receiving stipends, and another 1,300 that were being processed.

3. *Placement in employment.* About 1,000 enrollees have been placed in jobs, with slightly more than half placed after they returned home and the remainder placed directly from the center. Over 80 percent of the placements have involved jobs paying \$1.60 per hour or better; 28 percent had wage rates of more than \$2.00 per hour.

4. *Job Corps graduates.* As of May 30, 2,300 enrollees at the closed centers have graduated. Another 800 are scheduled to graduate before their centers close.

5. *Dropouts.* As of May 30, 1,100 enrollees have dropped out of the centers to be closed. The local offices in the home areas of these enrollees have been notified of their leaving. Since the enrollees will have to contact the local offices to obtain whatever pay and allowances owed to them, it is expected that they will contact the local office at which time they will be put into the same assessment and counseling program as the other enrollees. As soon as the bulk of the enrollees that checked in through the employment offices is satisfactorily taken care of, we plan to make special efforts to contact the dropouts that have not contacted the local office by checking with their parents, school officials, etc.

6. *Summary* (data rounded to nearest hundred).

Job Corps enrollees in centers to be closed.....	16,500
To graduate.....	3,100
To transfer to other centers.....	5,800
To be referred to jobs or training....	6,500
Dropouts.....	1,100
Referred to training.....	1,300
Placed in jobs.....	800
Placed in jobs.....	1,000
Still at Job Corps center.....	800
In transit to home area or data not received from local employment office because of lag in reporting ..	1,600
In counseling and assessment program.....	1,800
Receiving stipends.....	1,300
Being processed.....	1,300

I trust that this information will give you a clear picture of what has happened to enrollees at the centers to be closed.

During my April 25 appearance before your committee there were several requests made for information which I promised to supply for the record, but which we were unable to furnish the committee before the transcript was printed. I am now enclosing four tables developed in response to your inquiry about the need in the United States for manpower programs and the extent to which that need is being met (page 250 of the Hearings). Also enclosed is material relating to the cost of operating the new centers (page 275 of the Hearings).

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, May 29, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: This is in response to the questions raised in your telegram of May 7 concerning recruiting and processing of youngsters for the Job Corps.

At the time the recruiting freeze was imposed, Job Corps records indicated there were 3,542 males and 1,748 females for a total of 5,290 who had applications processed and accepted.

There were 2,753 males and 1,272 females with applications in various stages of processing by Job Corps.

Screeners have been advised informally to tell youths about the likely delay in entry. The following communication is being sent to all youths whose applications are presently held by the Job Corps:

"DEAR _____: Your application for the Job Corps has been processed and approved. At the present time, all openings in existing Job Corps centers are filled. As openings become available, you will be assigned based on the earliest applications on file departing first. While you are awaiting assignment, you should check in regularly with your local employment service office and screener. In closing, Job Corps wishes to thank you for your interest in the program and will advise you as soon as openings become available.

"Sincerely,

"_____,

"Job Corps Regional Administrator."

During mid-June, Job Corps will begin assigning young men to Men's Urban Centers. Civilian Conservation Center assignments are expected to resume in mid-July, and young women will be assigned to the remaining centers late in August or early in September.

Male recruiting will begin sometime in the middle or latter part of June and female recruiting in late July or early August.

Sincerely,

GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

Target group for NYC summer programs

(In-school youth 14 to 21)

Age, sex, and race	Number
Total, 14 to 21-----	1,530,000
Total, 14 to 15-----	837,000
Male, white-----	242,000
Male, nonwhite-----	140,000
Female, white-----	292,000
Female, nonwhite-----	163,000
Total, 16 to 17-----	215,000
Male, white-----	62,000
Male, nonwhite-----	37,000
Female, white-----	74,000
Female, nonwhite-----	42,000
Total, 18 to 21-----	478,000
Male, white-----	138,000
Male, nonwhite-----	80,000
Female, white-----	167,000
Female, nonwhite-----	93,000

Department of Labor.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I should like to make a short statement and then ask one or two questions. I am the first to say that the No. 1 urgent need in our country today, so far as meeting the conditions of those living in poverty is concerned, is to provide jobs.

I have a high priority for housing because of my responsibilities on the Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee.

But I think that, if given a choice of priorities, I would say that jobs should come first, because we would probably not be able to have housing without jobs, the lack of which brings about a condition of despair, a feeling of worthlessness in a society that is the most affluent society on earth today. The great gap which exists between those who work and those who do not is the feeling of being wanted and needed. This is particularly true with respect to young people. They have a feeling of frustration during the summer months, when they may be idle. Such a time of year brings young men and women out on to the streets, roaming about. I think that the distinguished Senator from New York, who has focused upon this particular aspect of unemployment, makes a very important point.

I cannot help thinking of the tragic, almost disastrous condition we have in my own State of Illinois, in the city of Cairo, where once again blacks and whites are engaged in an exchange of gunfire, with the National Guard lining up on one side to try to maintain law and order.

Here we have a condition that appears to be a racial fight. However, I cannot help believe that down underneath, the underlying struggle is for jobs. There are too few jobs in that community. The power structure is controlled by the whites. It is jobs that the blacks want. It is possibly for control of the power over those jobs that the struggle is all about.

It is the inadequacy of income to meet the sufficiencies of living that brings about these clashes.

The same condition exists in East St. Louis, a city presently in great difficulty. I hope that our hunger committee can go there for hearings and see at firsthand what the conditions are in that city, where, under normal conditions, year in and year out, one out of four young black males is unemployed—25 percent. From month to month they have a feeling of frustration and bitterness because of the lack of utilization of the education they have gained.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not doubt the need at all. I really feel that the American people are quite prepared, over the long pull, virtually to guarantee a job to every person who is able to work, and willing to work.

Mr. President, 70 percent of the people responded favorably to a Gallup poll question as to whether they would provide such a guarantee to an individual in this country.

Thus, the American people are willing to move up to see that if private industry cannot absorb all of the people available for work, then the public sector will undertake to provide the skill, the education, and the wherewithal to provide jobs in the public sector or as a supplement to the private sector; so that we can make it possible for those who are now idle, to work.

My question concerns the timing and the amount.

I have no doubt that the present Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schultz, is compassionate, knowledgeable, and an experienced man who, above all men I

know, desires to see idleness replaced with worthwhile work. I commend the administration for not wanting to see any cuts in the budget over last year. I am concerned that just the increase in our population alone and the increase in inflationary pressures should they just stand still, that we get from idle money, may release the amount of \$55 million so that it can be used. I think the Senator from New York would envision as the time schedule, if we approve the amendment, that it be made a part of the supplemental bill before us.

I ask the Senator from New York, what processes would be necessary, how long would it take until this money is actually approved and can be dispensed and placed in the hands of the mayors so that it can actually be put to use this summer? After all, summer has begun, school is out in many part of the country, and these youths are now idle.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the time limits are practicable because this is a supplemental and the House has already passed it. The House included nothing for this.

I should like to join with the Senator in respect to what he said about Secretary Schultz. He is a very broad-gaged man, with a deep understanding of the problems of the cities, as he has shown in many ways. I think that, in this particular case, he has been under considerable budgetary pressure, which is understandable because I think the President puts that on every Secretary, so that the Secretary of Labor has gone about as far as he can go in his survey of his own regional offices. He has turned up the need for \$25 million, and he found some \$16 million of that in programs where the money would not be used by the 30th of June. Then he advised us that an additional \$7.5 million was the minimum required. Of course, that is provided for in the bill.

Now we had almost a similar experience last year, when we came in very late and the supplemental appropriation was not made available until July 2.

The supplemental funds were used. I know what our experience is in New York City. The U.S. conference of mayors figures represent additional slots that can be put to use under the management techniques by which summer jobs are given to the Neighborhood Youth Corps in every one of the 50 cities, and the smaller cities. There are actually far more applications and people who need to be given the jobs than can be given. So it is very easy and quick to call in the people to whom this opportunity has been denied and give it to them. They are very delighted to get it.

In addition, the way in which this program works now is that there are only about 10 weeks, with the \$411 figure per slot. So there is still ample opportunity, before school opens, to use the money.

Furthermore—and this has been true in other situations—if the Senate should adopt this \$55 million proposal, with some assurance that if something better than what is offered will come out of conference, every city will keep a certain number of applicants on hand to be put quickly to work the minute the

money is forthcoming. As a matter of fact, last year New York City put them to work, taking a chance on an estimated figure that would come in. That is the tactical technique.

I will say that this is just about the last minute to get anything like this done. I have been around New York City a bit. As the Senator knows, we have quite a mayoralty campaign going on in New York City. As a result, I have been around the city in an unusually intensive way, though I live there and know it, anyway. I am deeply convinced that no assurance can be given as to which way the cities will go this summer. I think that in New York City we are especially fortunate to have a mayor who has a reputation for being able to keep the "roof" on the town. That will help us a great deal. But I still do not know, and I think, with all respect, nobody knows, how nicely adjusted the temper of the community is. There is plenty of reason for frustration. Not nearly enough has been done. At the same time, we do have some good marks for trying, and there are some visual evidences of our effort.

I wish to tell the Senator from Illinois that he should take tremendous satisfaction from his role in housing. I see it on every side. I think the Appropriations Committee has recognized it by the restoration which has been made even in the supplemental bill. When the regular appropriation bill comes before us, we may have a little trouble, but these are very good programs, especially the program for home subsidies.

I feel that it is feasible and practical, as the Conference of Mayors has suggested, to act now on this particular supplemental bill, which has to be completed before the end of the month, anyway, for other reasons than this particular appropriation. We could expect that the money will be effectively used and that it will have a measurable impact on the situation in our big cities.

I should like to point out to the Senator something that is very interesting to me. Last summer the Neighborhood Youth Corps was very effective in "cooling down" our hot cities. This was not because they were vigilantes or were special policemen, but it was because they wore clean clothing and were in effect saying, "I am doing something, and the Government is trying to help." This was very persuasive on people who were inclined to lose their temper and their heads.

Considering the amount involved, I think it is a desirable and wise provision by us. I shall put it to the Senate in the temperate and modest way in which I have put it now. Like my colleagues, we are exploring a field where the difference between a situation of reasonable acceptability and one which is very dangerous to the country may be a hair's breadth, and this may be the breadth.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the explanation given to me. From my own experience, looking at the figures of the request for the city of Chicago that has been submitted, this sum would provide an additional 8,800 jobs. Here is a city of 3.5 million people, and one wonders what difference 8,800

jobs would make. But it does make a difference to every single boy who will be employed and helped. I can remember very well every summer I worked in between school terms. I can remember how it added to my experience and how I felt an additional importance because of that work, no matter how menial it was.

Every student who can get work may prevent himself from being a dropout. It can help him have a sense of worthwhileness. It can give him a sense of appreciation for education, which is the most powerful weapon he can have, and what it can mean to him in later life.

In my own city of Chicago, what we would be voting for would be to give young people 8,800 jobs which can help them feel worthwhile, and not like an IBM card, unwanted, unrelated, and unneeded in a society which is moving ever faster and leaving the individual behind. Here is our chance to step up and help.

With the confidence and knowledge of my distinguished colleague in this field, in which he has been so preeminent, we can vote to so employ this money. I hope we can do it. I wish we could increase the money. I am sympathetic with our administration's effort to try to stop inflation and to try to protect the income of people who are having their pockets picked because of the ravages of inflation. I would rather see the money cut out of some other part of the budget and put into these jobs.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. He has asked a question which is very perceptive. According to the figures we have, the target population has increased by thousands. We will have something like a million and a half this year. That is the reason for doing better.

Mr. PERCY. So if we do the same as last year, we are slipping back, because of the population increase. We must add the factor of population.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

There was a story in the New York Times last Sunday in which it was stated that the private industry community was expected to do better. Every bit of evidence we have indicates the private business community will have to do much better. After all, last summer was not a bed of roses. I hope private business will do better. One of the ways to encourage private business to do better is to show that we will do better.

I thank my colleague for his support.

THE ADAM CLAYTON POWELL DECISION

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the Supreme Court, in the Adam Clayton Powell decision, announced today, showed again the determination of the Supreme Court to usurp the powers and prerogatives of Congress.

In my judgment, the decision that the House of Representatives was without power to exclude POWELL from the 90th Congress was contemptible and spiteful, and an arrogant affront to Congress.

It gave indication of Chief Justice Warren's determination to use what I hope is his swansong, as a vehicle to give

Congress a parting slap; and also to try to make of the Supreme Court a super-Government riding herd over the other branches of Government and usurping their duties and responsibilities.

It mattered not to Chief Justice Warren that POWELL had been found by the House to be guilty of misuse of public funds. Warren ruled that no matter how POWELL had conducted himself, if he had been elected by his constituency, was over 25, had been a citizen for more than 7 years, and was an inhabitant of the State from which he had been elected, he could not be denied a seat of the House of Representatives.

Following the Court's reasoning, Congress must seat any person no matter how reprehensible his conduct, how unscrupulous his character, no matter how disloyal to ethical principles, if he is elected and meets the age, citizenship and residence requirements of the Constitution. No other qualifications or lack of them can be brought into play.

The Supreme Court ignored the fact that the Constitution gives each House of Congress the power to judge the qualifications of its Members and punish its Members for disorderly behavior. This power of Congress has, before now, been unquestioned during the 180 years of our existence as a Republic.

I think it is significant that the Supreme Court in reaching this decision reversed a decision of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia, of which Judge Warren E. Burger is a member.

Judge Burger's line of reasoning will be a welcome relief from that of Chief Justice Warren.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 16, 1969, under authority of the order of June 13, 1969:

ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Harold F. Faught, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ridgeway B. Knight, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

William F. Buckley, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for the term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1972, vice Sigurd S. Larmom, term expired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Gerald S. Levin, of California, to be U.S. District Judge for the northern district of

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 18, 1969
For actions of June 17, 1969
91st 1st -No. 99

CONTENTS

Aging.....	25	Health.....	36	Recreation.....	15
Appropriations.....	2,42	Health benefits.....	30	Reports.....	31
Cigarettes.....	3	Hunger.....	13,35	Retirement.....	30,37
Claims.....	41	Inspection service.....	38	Rural development.....	21
Consumer protection.....	18	Interest rates.....	7,11,26	Safety.....	12
Continuing		Lands.....	15	Small business.....	34
appropriations.....	2	Mexican-American Affairs		Social security.....	28
Contracts.....	31	20	Solid waste disposal.....	24
Cotton.....	27	Monopolies.....	5	Supplemental	
Education.....	23,33,43	Parking.....	8	appropriations.....	10
Employment.....	33	Pay raise.....	4	Tariff.....	44
Environment.....	29	Personnel.....	30	Taxation.....	6,22,37
Farm payments.....	27	Pesticides.....	16	Trade commission.....	9
Flood protection.....	14	Pollution.....	17,24	Watersheds.....	21
Food stamps.....	19,40	Population research.....	36	Weather.....	39
Foreign affairs.....	32	Reclamation.....	1		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated second supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses received President's Federal pay comparability message. Reps. May and others introduced and Reps. May and Taft discussed food stamp bill. Rep. Natcher inserted Sen. Bayh's address, "Watershed Development--An Avenue to Rural Development."

HOUSE

1. RECLAMATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 742, to authorize the Kennewick division extension, Yakima project, Wash. p. H4933

2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reported ^{without amendment} H. R. 12167, to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Rept. 91-315). p. H4933

Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 782, making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1969 for postal employees (pp. S6613, H4878-80). Rep. Mahon stated, "A continuing resolution for fiscal 1970 is scheduled for consideration in the early future, probably next week," for **the whole Government**. This measure will now be sent to the President.

3. CIGARETTES. Completed general debate on H. R. 6543, to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking. The bill is to be read for amendment today. pp. H4880-4917

4. PAY RAISE. Both Houses received from the President the annual comparison of Federal salaries with the salaries paid in private enterprise. pp. H4918, S6615

5. MONOPOLIES. Rep. Tiernan criticized "what appears to be the beginning of a new antitrust policy." pp. H4926-7

6. TAXATION. The "Daily Digest" says the Ways and Means Committee "approved decisions to extend excise taxes for another year on telephones and automobiles; continue the 10-percent income tax surcharge until the end of this year and reduce it to 5 percent from January to June 30 of next year; repeal the investment tax credit; and to provide for low-income allowances." p. D512

Rep. Saylor criticized "intimated" extension of the surtax and inserted an article, "Scuttling Tax Reform." p. H4927

7. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Podell stated that under no circumstances can this prime rate increase be justified. p. H4932

8. PARKING. Received from GAO a report on improvements in the management of Government parking facilities by the GSA. p. H4933

9. TRADE COMMISSION. Both Houses received from the Federal Trade Commission its annual report for fiscal year 1968. pp. H4933, S6519

SENATE

10. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969 (pp. S6597-6603). Rejected, 16-80, an amendment by Sen. Williams, Del., to serve as a substitute for the committee amendments to title IV of the bill establishing with certain exemptions a limitation on fiscal year 1970 budget outlays (pp. S6602-13).

of them—have returned to Dong Ap Bia, the 3,000-foot mountain where U.S. paratroopers fought a bloody battle that sparked congressional criticism, intelligence sources said today.

Maj. Gen. John M. Wright Jr., commander of the 101st Airborne Division, said he is prepared to send troops up the mountain again "should the situation warrant it."

Wright said there are no present plans for another ground assault, but added Hill 937—the military designation for Ap Bia—"is no different from any other piece of terrain in our area of operations."

If it becomes necessary to attack again, he said, "I am prepared to commit everything that it takes, up to the entire division, to do the job."

Wright speculated the North Vietnamese may have returned to hold the hill as an anchor for a perimeter guarding nearby supply caches in the Ashau Valley or as a radio communications base.

U.S. aircraft flying near the jungled slopes of Ap Bia have drawn ground fire in recent days and American forces have retaliated with artillery and aerial bombardment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to comment upon military tactics in detail. I must say that this meat grinder operation of search and destroy, of abandonment and retaking, is perturbing. Hamburger Hill is still there, the valley is still there, the dead have been removed, and the Vietcong are back on Hamburger Hill.

I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that I think there is no one in the United States who does not want this war to come to an end. We want to support President Nixon in his efforts. He is the President, and he has to make the decisions. However, I think it is high time that he recognized that a political settlement is the essence of the settlement which is needed to carry this matter to a successful conclusion. President Nixon has said this repeatedly. I hope he does not permit his decision in the past to reach a political settlement to be interfered with by people who are not interested in political settlement. I hope the President does not get into a position where he feels that the preservation of the present regime in Saigon is more important than his own basic decision on this matter.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. Since the President ruled out a military victory I see no feasible course except political conciliation and settlement. What other way is there to end the war except on the battlefield or at the conference table?

I share the Senator's view and I trust that the hard decision will not any longer be postponed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have read what the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has had to say with a great deal of interest. He indicates, of course, that it is impossible for us to "impose"—and that is the key word—a coalition government in South Vietnam.

Mr. GORE. Or the will of the people to live together among themselves in peace.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. But the Senator may recall that in

the elections of September a year ago in South Vietnam two groups were excluded, the so-called neutralists and the Vietcong.

It would be my hope that in some way it would be possible to bring about—so to speak—a coming together of the people who live in South Vietnam, including the NLF, neutralists, and others not allowed to vote in the election in September a year ago.

It is my firm belief that a coalition in South Vietnam is inevitable, and the sooner these people get together in some way or other and bring about elections, which President Thieu indicated he would be in favor of, the better off they and we will be.

It was interesting to learn that President Thieu, perhaps on the basis of pressure from the present administration, did indicate some weeks ago that his government would be willing to meet with representatives of the NLF privately. I would consider that to be the first step toward public meetings, and that he would allow, thereafter, the Vietcong and others to participate in elections if they changed their labels. That is, of course, gloss and does not mean much.

However, the Senator is correct that if there is to be peace in Vietnam it will not be on the battlefield, but in Paris, and it will be on the basis of the Vietnamese deciding what kind of government they will have and what the future should hold for them, because the decision is theirs.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. It is partly for that reason that I have felt, rightly or wrongly, that a phased withdrawal, a long and drawn out withdrawal of a few men at a time—25,000 being less than 5 percent of our forces there—carries with it, if not a commitment, at least an implied commitment to keep sufficient American forces there to maintain the Thieu-Ky regime in power.

Mr. Thieu and Mr. Ky should be told in no uncertain terms and quickly that it is necessary to have a coalition of the factions and forces of the people of South Vietnam, and all of our efforts should be used in that direction. We will find no peace in maintaining the Thieu-Ky regime in power.

I call to the attention of the Senate that only a few days ago a committee of distinguished Americans returned from an investigation in South Vietnam and reported to this country that thousands, many thousands of political prisoners, religious leaders, even children suspected of being sympathetic with the Vietcong, are prisoners without trial. Are we to find peace or security in supporting such a regime? I do not think we shall find either.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that pursuant to the provisions of 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. BROWN, of Ohio, as a member of the Joint Economic Committee, to fill the

existing vacancy thereon, vice Mr. RUMSFELD, excused.

The message announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 783) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. H.R. 11400, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments, with the exception of the two committee amendments, the first on pages 70, 71, and 72 of the bill, and the second on lines 6, 7, and 8 on page 73, be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason thereof.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, after the word "Navy", strike out "\$14,500,000" and insert "\$21,500,000".

On page 2, line 13, after the word "Force", strike out "\$115,000,000" and insert "\$146,000,000".

On page 2, line 20, after "\$15,390,000," insert "and in addition, \$8,910,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Procurement, Marine Corps'".

On page 3, after line 17, insert:

"SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"FLOOD PREVENTION

"For an additional amount for 'Flood prevention', \$4,000,000 to remain available until expended for emergency measures for runoff retardation and soil erosion prevention, as provided by section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (33 U.S.C. 701 b-1)."

On page 4, line 21 after "Corps," strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert "\$6,400,000."

On page 5, line 7, after "\$3,600,000," insert "and in addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Procurement, Marine Corps'."

On page 5, line 12, after "\$10,000,000," insert "and in addition, \$3,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army'."

On page 5, line 18, after "\$8,800,000," insert "and in addition, \$5,377,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Other Procurement, Air Force'."

On page 5, after line 20, strike out:

"General Provision

"SEC. 201. Deficiencies incurred under the terms of section 3732 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 11), shall not exceed the amounts of the estimates in House Documents Numbered 91-50 and 91-94, or the amounts provided herein, whichever is lower, for each such authorized purpose."

On page 6, after line 10, insert:

"LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

"For an additional amount for 'Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay', for the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$18,736,000."

On page 6, line 23, after "\$10,034,000," insert "of which \$95,000 for the Department of Corrections shall remain available until September 30, 1969, and".

On page 7, after line 16, insert:

"CAPITAL OUTLAY

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay', \$18,736,000, of which \$1,514,000 shall not be available for expenditure until July 1, 1969."

On page 8, line 7, after "2,700,000" insert "to be derived by transfer from appropriations for 'Economic Assistance', fiscal year 1969, of the Agency for International Development."

On page 8, after line 13, insert:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT**"INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS****"SUBSCRIPTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION**

"For payment of the first installment of the United States share of the 1969-1971 increase in the resources of the International Development Association, as authorized by law, \$160,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 9, line 6, after the word "telecommunications", strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$777,000".

On page 9, line 16, after "\$600,000" insert "of which \$100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

At the top of page 10, insert:

"NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION**"SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

"The appropriation granted under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1969, shall be available for the purchase of one aircraft for replacement only."

On page 10, at the beginning of line 9, strike out "\$2,573,000" and insert "\$3,139,000."

On page 10, line 13, after the word "pensions", strike out "\$179,000,000" and insert "\$276,600,000".

On page 10, at the beginning of line 17, strike out "\$14,200,000" and insert "\$89,200,000".

On page 10, line 20, after the word "care", strike out "\$46,189,000" and insert "\$53,800,000".

On page 11, line 8, after the word "by" strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000"; and at the beginning of line 11, strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000".

On page 11, after line 22, insert:

"DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT**"FAIR HOUSING PROGRAM**

"For an additional amount for 'Fair housing program', \$1,000,000."

On page 12, after line 13, insert:

"EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

"For an additional amount for 'Education and welfare services', \$2,781,000."

On page 12, at the beginning of line 19, strike out "\$2,769,000" and insert "\$2,700,000, of which \$150,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969."

On page 13, after line 2, strike out:

"For a repayable advance to the 'Land and water conservation fund,' as authorized by section 4(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601-7), for liquidation of obligations incurred against such fund pursuant to law, \$19,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 13, after line 14, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE TERRITORIES**"ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES**

"For an additional amount of 'Administration of territories', \$950,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 13, line 22, after the word "research", strike out "\$2,092,000" and insert "\$2,242,000".

On page 14, after line 1, insert:

"HEALTH AND SAFETY

"For an additional amount for 'Health and safety', \$750,000 to remain available until September 30, 1969."

On page 14, line 7, after the word "fund", strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000".

On page 14, line 21, after "\$1,353,000," insert "of which \$250,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

On page 15, line 9, after the word "protection", strike out "\$2,479,000" and insert "\$2,366,000".

On page 15, line 13, after the word "Construction", strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$1,103,000".

On page 15, line 19, after the word "management", strike out "\$25,028,000" and insert "\$24,374,000, of which \$460,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

On page 15, line 4, after the word "Construction", strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$400,000".

On page 16, line 8, after the word "received" insert "prior to September 1, 1969".

On page 16, after line 20, insert:

"MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION**"MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES**

"For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, \$7,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1969."

On page 17, line 11, after the word "activities", insert "\$19,920,000"; and, after the amendment just stated, strike out "including payments authorized by section 108(b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as amended (Public Law 90-354, approved June 20, 1968), and annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), \$11,161,000, of which \$3,920,000 shall remain available until expended for said annual interest grants: *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from 'Community mental health resource support', Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act", and insert in lieu thereof "of which \$3,920,000 shall be for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), to remain available until expended for said annual interest grants, and \$16,000,000 shall be for educational opportunity grants under part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, to remain available through June 30, 1970: *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be

derived by transfer from 'Community mental health resource support', Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act."

On page 18, line 23, after "\$9,186,000," insert "to remain available until September 30, 1969".

On page 19, after line 7, strike out:

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

"For grants and loans pursuant to the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457), \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 19, after line 21, insert:

"SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION**"LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

"For an additional amount of 'Limitation on salaries and expenses', Social Security Administration, \$21,200,000, to be expended, as authorized by section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein."

On page 20, after line 5, insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Vide G. Bartlett, widow of E. L. Bartlett, late a Senator from the State of Alaska, \$30,000."

"The clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the States of Illinois and Texas shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of eleven million, the population of said States having exceeded eleven million inhabitants."

"For an additional amount for 'Inquiries and Investigations', fiscal year 1968, \$126,900."

On page 21, after line 10, insert:

"CHAPTER IX**"PUBLIC WORKS****"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL****"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY****"CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL****"FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES**

"For an additional amount for 'Flood control and coastal emergencies', \$25,000,000, to remain until expended."

At the top of page 22, insert:

"INDEPENDENT OFFICES**"ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION****"PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT**

"For and additional amount for 'Plant and Capital Equipment', \$45,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 22, line 7, change the chapter number from "IX" to "X".

On page 22, line 12, after "\$65,000," insert "of which \$40,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

On page 22, line 23, after the word "activities", strike out "\$1,314,000" and insert "\$1,277,000, of which \$101,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

On page 23, line 19, after "\$2,505,000" insert "of which \$162,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

On page 24, line 13, after "\$1,187,000" insert "of which \$737,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

At the top of page 25, insert:

"ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION**"SALARIES AND EXPENSES**

"In addition to the amount made available in the appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1969, for retirement pay of commissioned officers and payments under the Retired Service."

man's Family Protection Plan, \$147,000 shall be available in that appropriation for such expenses."

On page 26, at the beginning of line 9, strike out "\$1,975,000" and insert "\$1,948,000".

On page 26, line 12, after "\$2,412,000" insert "of which \$205,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

"FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

"For an additional amount for 'Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel', fiscal year 1968, \$850,000.

"For an additional amount for 'Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel', fiscal year 1969, \$850,000."

On page 27, line 3, after "\$97,500" insert "of which \$10,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969".

On page 27, line 7, change the chapter number from "X" to "XI".

On page 27, after line 8, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', \$2,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1969, for necessary expenses in connection with the consolidation of Departmental activities into the Southwest Area of Washington, D.C."

On page 28, line 5, change the chapter number from "XI" to "XII".

On page 28, after line 12, insert:

"U.S. SECRET SERVICE

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses' \$470,000."

On page 28, at the beginning of line 21, strike out "\$107,000" and insert "\$100,000".

On page 28, at the beginning of line 25, strike out "\$200,000" and insert "\$147,000".

At the top of page 29, change the chapter number from "XI" to "XIII".

On page 29, line 8, after the word "Congress" strike out "\$16,880,812" and insert "\$18,118,688".

On page 30, after line 1, insert:

"SENATE

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators, \$458,270;

"Salaries, officers and employees, \$1,647,837;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, \$21,905;

"Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Senate policy committees, \$27,190;

"Automobiles and maintenance, \$2,180;

"Inquiries and investigations, \$370,640; including \$14,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;

"Folding documents, \$2,565;

"Miscellaneous items, \$169,015, including \$100,500 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961;"

On page 32, after line 15, insert:

"Senate office buildings, \$174,000;

"Senate garage, \$6,500;"

On page 34, line 2, after the word "expenses," strike out "\$2,214,000" and insert "\$2,114,000".

On page 37, line 17, after the word "programs," strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert "\$2,000,000".

On page 43, line 8, after the word "Army," strike out "\$230,000,000" and insert "\$300,000,000".

On page 43, line 10, after the word "Navy," strike out "\$160,000,000" and insert "\$198,700,000".

On page 43, line 12, after the word "Corps," strike out "\$45,000,000" and insert "\$61,500,000".

On page 43, line 14, after the word "Force," strike out "\$214,000,000" and insert "\$267,600,000".

On page 43, line 16, after the word "Army," strike out "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$16,400,000".

On page 43, line 22, after "\$32,000,000,"

insert "and in addition, \$3,600,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Agencies'".

On page 44, line 11, after the word "expenses," strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,100,000".

On page 47, line 23, after the word from, strike out "the amount reserved under"; and in line 24, after the word "Service, strike out pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364" and insert "fiscal year 1969" on page 48, line 3, after the word "to", strike out "said" and in the same line after "201" insert "of Public Law 90-364".

On page 66, after line 13, insert: "limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, (Release of \$4,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);".

On page 67, line 4, after the word "expenses," strike out "\$32,000" and insert "\$41,000".

On page 67, line 16, after the word "expenses" strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$400,000".

On page 73, after line 8, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 504. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1969, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1969, or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: *Provided*, That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appropriations and authority for the fiscal year 1969 as well as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof."

FULL FUNDING FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I note the decision of the Appropriations Committee to restore the full funding for educational opportunity grants. Last year the Senate agreed to appropriate \$140.6 million for these important student aid grants. In conference with the House, however, \$16 million was deleted from the bill. Since the appropriations bill was long overdue, there was no practical way to prolong the fight for this one item at that time.

Now the decision has been made to restore this \$16 million item and to bring appropriations for equal opportunity grants more nearly up to a level which meets the need. Since 1966, initial year awards have been made to 123,000, then 132,000, and last year to 140,000 beginning college students. At the same time, through the efforts of the colleges themselves, and under the inspiration of programs like Upward Bound and Talent Search, more students than ever before are becoming interested in attending college.

There are still many young people who will not be able to go on to higher education, even with the full funding provided by this supplemental appropriation. But the \$16 million restoration will go a long way toward filling the gap for 1969. I commend the committee for its good efforts, and express my sincere hope that the sum will be retained.

RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to offer my support for the restoration of the educational opportunity grant funds as recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

Last April, a group of students from each of the State universities in Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin came to Washington. They came to discuss with their Senators and Representatives the problems confronting their institutions because of the shortage in Federal financial aid funds, particularly those for opportunity grants. They came with the belief that legal, nonviolent activities through the political process could bring about desirable change. They left hopeful that needed funds for education would be provided.

The issues raised by these students have been reiterated constantly by their professors, deans, and college presidents who have written and visited their congressional delegation urging funds for educational opportunity grants. They are rightly concerned.

Last year the conference committee considering educational opportunity grants reallocated \$16 million from the \$140.6 million appropriations for this program. The loss of these funds deprived about 32,000 deserving students of the financial assistance they needed to attend college. In Illinois alone, the cut-back meant that about 4,300 instead of 6,500 disadvantaged students received EOG funds for education.

Mr. President, we are now making a great effort through Educational Talent Search, Upward Bound, and other programs to seek out young people and encourage them to go to college so that they can become contributing members of society. EOG funds help insure that they have the financial means to obtain this higher education. By reducing the funds of this program, we are doing them and our country a disservice. I am, therefore, pleased that the committee has approved the restoration of the \$16 million to extend educational opportunities to eager and ambitious young men and women.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a most compelling reason for including the \$16 million that had been cut from the educational opportunity grants program in this supplemental appropriations bill is that we will be keeping faith both with our institutions of higher learning and with our most disadvantaged students. I commend the Appropriations Committee for its action, and urge the Senate and the conference committee to sustain that action.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 required institutions receiving EOG funds to make intensive efforts to recruit needy students. The act advises them to seek out indigent students in the 11th grade or lower, and to make conditional educational opportunity commitments to them.

Many such commitments have been made. When last year's appropriations for the EOG program were reduced by \$16 million—reducing thereby the number of EOG awards—many colleges were faced with a difficult problem: they had to choose between breaching faith with students by breaking those commitments, or increasing their institutional deficits to uphold them. Several institutions were forced to cut back or delay the implementation of programs for the benefit of

highly able, but financially deprived, young people. In the words of Malcolm Moos, president of the University of Minnesota:

Such federal cutbacks jeopardize not only our work with low income students presently at the university, but also our future recruitment programs. In addition, these cutbacks create hardships for the student group least able to cope with them, and may well increase campus tensions as institutions are unable to assist our economically deprived.

Other evidence testifies to the extent of the harm which would result from any prolonged reduction in EOG appropriations, and shows the wisdom behind the Appropriations Committee's recommendation. I ask unanimous consent that certain relevant letters and telegrams be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HEW MEMORANDUM OF JUNE 12, 1969, SHOWING ESTIMATED NUMBER OF STUDENTS TO BE AIDED BY \$16,000,000 RESTORATION

	Estimated number of initial year students	Existing budget	Under \$16,000,000 increase	Additional students, fiscal year 1970
	(1)	(2)	(3)	
Total.....	\$100,200	\$132,190	31,990	
10. Alabama.....	1,350	2,190	840	
11. Alaska.....	40	50	10	
12. Arizona.....	1,100	1,350	250	
13. Arkansas.....	1,150	1,270	120	
14. California.....	9,050	13,090	4,040	
15. Colorado.....	1,500	1,710	210	
16. Connecticut.....	1,300	1,630	330	
17. Delaware.....	275	300	25	
18. District of Columbia.....	800	920	120	
19. Florida.....	2,450	3,010	560	
20. Georgia.....	1,650	2,270	620	
21. Hawaii.....	400	400	0	
22. Idaho.....	425	520	95	
23. Illinois.....	4,375	6,550	2,175	
24. Indiana.....	2,450	3,690	1,240	
25. Iowa.....	2,100	2,620	520	
26. Kansas.....	1,825	2,270	445	
27. Kentucky.....	1,775	2,100	325	
28. Louisiana.....	2,150	2,520	370	
29. Maine.....	450	540	90	
30. Maryland.....	1,675	1,680	5	
31. Massachusetts.....	3,450	5,010	1,560	
32. Michigan.....	4,350	5,960	1,610	
33. Minnesota.....	2,650	3,300	650	
34. Mississippi.....	1,300	1,600	300	
35. Missouri.....	2,600	3,460	860	
36. Montana.....	550	590	40	
37. Nebraska.....	1,075	1,220	145	
38. Nevada.....	125	160	35	
39. New Hampshire.....	400	530	130	
40. New Jersey.....	1,800	2,270	470	
41. New Mexico.....	600	720	120	
42. New York.....	6,900	10,120	3,220	
43. North Carolina.....	2,500	3,130	630	
44. North Dakota.....	525	760	235	
45. Ohio.....	5,050	6,540	1,490	
46. Oklahoma.....	2,200	2,310	110	
47. Oregon.....	1,300	1,720	420	
48. Pennsylvania.....	4,875	6,650	1,775	
49. Rhode Island.....	600	760	160	
50. South Carolina.....	825	1,210	385	
51. South Dakota.....	550	660	110	
52. Tennessee.....	1,900	2,910	1,010	
53. Texas.....	5,625	7,350	1,725	
54. Utah.....	1,425	1,480	55	
55. Vermont.....	375	430	55	
56. Virginia.....	1,850	2,200	350	
57. Washington.....	2,150	2,790	640	
58. West Virginia.....	1,000	1,250	250	
59. Wisconsin.....	2,400	3,310	910	
60. Wyoming.....	250	280	30	
61. U.S. service schools.....				
62. Canal Zone.....				
63. Guam.....	50	50	0	
64. Puerto Rico.....	650	850	200	
66. Virgin Islands.....	10	10	0	

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
June 13, 1969.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Hamline University urges that strong consideration be given towards sustaining the

action of the Senate Appropriations Committee to add a \$16 million supplemental appropriation to the Educational Opportunity Grants program as well as any action towards receiving a supplemental national defense loan allocation. The programs are not presently funded at the level needed to assist the number of students eligible for them.

J. B. KNUESEL,
Director of Financial Aids.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
June 13, 1969.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge serious consideration of legislation for supplementary appropriation for Federal financial aid program EOG work study. National defense loans all need help.

LEONARD WENC,
Director of Financial Aid MacAlester
College.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
June 13, 1969.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge full consideration and support for additional funding of H.E.W.Q. programs.

RAY Q. MOCK,
Chairman, Financial Aid College of St.
Thomas.

MANKATO, MINN.,
June 13, 1969.

WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The Minnesota State Association of financial aid administrators urges you to support the supplemental appropriations for the national defense student loan and educational opportunity grant programs. These vital programs must be funded in order that institutions of higher education are able to assist the many disadvantaged students who without such assistance would be unable to attend college. Your assistance will be greatly appreciated.

ROBERT J. MATUSKA,
President of Minnesota State Association
of Financial Aid Administrators and
Director of Financial Aids, Mankato
State College.

ST. PETER, MINN.,
June 13, 1969.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support the supplemental EOG allocation when voted on in the Senate. We are unable to fund many eligible EOG candidates. We also encourage additional funding of NDEA.

BRUCE GREY,
Director of Financial Aid, Gustavus
Adolphus College.

NORTHWEST MINNESOTA YOUTH
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT,
Bemidji, Minn., March 21, 1969.

HON. ROBERT FINCH,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY FINCH: As the director of an Educational Talent Search program funded under the Higher Education Act of 1965, I wish to call your attention to the acute problem which the reduction of funds for Educational Opportunity Grants has precipitated.

The cut-back puts the level of funding for 1969-70 initial year grants 22 per cent below that of the current school year for economically disadvantaged young people planning to continue their education beyond high school. This tremendous reduction in initial year grants is taking place at a time when Educational Talent Search counselors have

been identifying ever larger numbers of youth who should pursue higher education. In addition, it comes after financial aid officers have complied with the requirements of Section 407 of Title IV, Part A, of the Higher Education Act of 1965 which encouraged them to make conditional commitments to high school eleventh graders and lower. For the Federal government to establish programs such as Educational Talent Search and request financial aid officers to make conditional commitments, then to reduce the funds necessary to carry through these commitments will result in vast numbers of disillusioned youth from the ranks of those we have been attempting to encourage.

I am also writing to the representatives and senators from the state of Minnesota to request their support in efforts to get a supplemental appropriation for initial year Educational Opportunity Grants. An appropriation of 16 million dollars would restore the reduction that has been made at the committee level. I feel that it would be of tremendous assistance to them, however, if the administration would recommend such a supplemental appropriation. It is my feeling that the minimum supplemental appropriation that should be considered by the Administration and the Congress is the 16 million dollars necessary to restore the funding to the 1968-69 level. There would still be numerous eligible students who would not be able to gain assistance, but at least we would not be losing ground.

Immediate action is necessary as the funds sought come from Fiscal 1969. In addition, it is imperative that the colleges be notified of the restoration of funds soon to enable them to provide needy students with the financial aid packages necessary for them to continue education. Hopefully, this can be accomplished before they become disillusioned with our Federal government and its various programs.

I am also writing to Acting Commissioner Muirhead and to President Nixon to request their support in this serious situation.

Sincerely,
MARK O. PAULSON,
Director.

REDWOOD FALLS, MINN.,
June 15, 1969.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Attached is a copy of a letter received by my 18 year old son who graduated this Spring from the Redwood Falls High School. He has previously applied and been accepted for attendance at Southwest Minnesota State College at Marshall, Minn. beginning with the Fall term. Your attention is particularly invited to the second sentence of the second paragraph of the attached letter.

It is going to be difficult to reconcile his feelings that he may be unable to attend college for lack of the amount required to supplement his first year attendance expense. With over 40 Billion being expended in Vietnam annually and a like amount in the military complex, the sum required by him seems like a mite. The question is, which is more important?

Your reply will be greatly appreciated so I can explain to my son what his future possibility is in regard to attending College.

Respectfully yours,
HARRY C. WALTER.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY,
Bloomington, Ind., June 6, 1969.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I wish to urge serious consideration of restoration of funds to the federal student aid programs—more particularly, the Educational Opportunity Grant Program. At this time in our history,

with rising student expectations and rising college costs, the necessity for a program designed for students from low income families is critically apparent.

At Indiana University, for example, we are bringing to the campus this summer 200 very disadvantaged students to begin their college work. The summer work is preparation to their continuing education in the fall. Almost all of these students require assistance under the EOG Program. By providing for this group of students, we have only \$35,000 in EOG funds to meet the needs of the other entering freshmen who need \$250,000 in EOG funds. Therefore, many deserving and otherwise qualified students will be denied the opportunities of higher education.

It is important that the maximum amount of funds possible be restored to the EOG Program. I stress the concern of financial aid officers for providing financial assistance to the economically disadvantaged. We hope the Congress will provide the funds necessary to meet our commitments to the students.

Sincerely yours,

EDSON W. SAMPLE,
Assistant Director.

MAY 27, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The students at Augsburg College, Minneapolis, received notice last week that Federal funds for the coming school year were cut severely. Although the cuts did not affect me, many of my friends had their scholarships and grants significantly reduced. As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, I would ask you to please do all you can to prevent any further cuts, and, if possible to restore what has been lost. The cost of attending a private college has soared the past three years and cutbacks in aid are making the price of attending a private college beyond the reach of many middle class incomes. Certainly schools such as Augsburg play a vital role in enriching our American society and I would stress the fact that government interest and support for them is a wise investment.

I will be a senior at Augsburg in the fall and have come to a fairly full realization of the ridiculous contradictions in our societies' value system. Student revolt can hardly be termed an unexpected phenomenon, and although I heartily disapprove of needless destruction and the kind of student-initiated violence we have witnessed this past year, I share the frustration and helpless anger that gives rise to unrest. Certainly the co-existence of a war in Viet Nam and government cutbacks in aid to fine educational institutions symbolizes the tragic confusion that exists in our government today.

From what I've heard of you, I would guess that you might agree with much of what I've said, but I nevertheless ask your help and your understanding. A nation of concerned young people and a community of hopeful students is watching.

Sincerely,

MARY ALICE LONG,
Class of 1970.

SOUTHWEST MINNESOTA STATE COLLEGE,
Marshall, Minn., June 12, 1969.

CHARLES H. WALTER,
Redwood Falls, Minn.

DEAR CHARLES: The Financial Aids Committee has reviewed your application and we regret we shall be unable to grant you financial aid for the coming academic year at Southwest Minnesota State College.

Your application definitely indicates that you are in need of financial assistance to attend the college. However, a reduction in Federal funds for the coming academic year has made it impossible for us to provide assistance to you.

However, attempts are being made at this

time to secure additional funds for our financial aid program and if additional funds are obtained, you will be among the first to be considered for financial aid.

In the meantime, we would strongly suggest that you investigate the Guaranteed Bank Loan program. This program is administered by local banks and you should check with banks in your area to see if they participate in the program. These loans are made to students at no interest rate while you are in school and a seven percent (7%) rate of interest after you leave school with five to ten years to repay the loan.

We are sorry we cannot be of assistance at this time but you will be hearing from us if additional funds are made available.

If you have questions, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely,

MELVIN R. RENNER,
Director of Admissions and Registrar.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in particular, I call my colleagues' attention to two letters, one received from a senior at Augsburg College in Minneapolis, Minn., and the other, from a father whose son has been denied financial aid.

I stress, gentlemen, that it is not only in response to such clear expressions of need that the Appropriations Committee has called for a restoration of the EOG funds. It is also in direct response to the mandate of certain basic American traditions. For generations, the United States has been known as the land of opportunity; for generations, we have vowed that every American's birthright includes equal opportunity, personal freedom, and self-determination. More recently, we have recognized that a precursor for the exercise of that birthright is knowledge, which can be achieved only with the access to advanced and continuing education. As a people, we are committed to the value and promise of education; as a Government of the people, we are committed to making that promise a reality. The EOG program, enhanced by this supplemental appropriation, contributes to that effort, and it deserves our support.

To say that the EOG supplemental appropriation would be an improvement is not to say that nothing remains to be done. On the contrary, as the Nixon Task Force Report on Education has itself reported:

Among the most serious problems facing education in the Nation is that of the financing of higher education. Viewed as a problem extending over the next decade, it is a matter of more than doubling the resources available to colleges and universities, from the present \$17.2 billion to approximately \$41 billion, to provide places for an additional 3 million students, many of them from disadvantaged backgrounds.

I suggest that the major challenges in education still confront us. This is highlighted by the fact that even if we approve this supplemental appropriation now before us, EOG initial year appropriations for fiscal year 1969 would provide for only 57 percent—\$68 million, compared with \$120 million requested—of the total amount requested by institutions for initial year grants. I stress, therefore, that we should support this restoration of funds with full awareness of the fact that, while it will at least prevent a slip backwards, it does not pro-

vide for the tremendous forthright advance, which we require.

I repeat, my approval of the Appropriations Committee action, and I urge that we concur with that action, understanding that, at best, we are only beginning to meet the obligations of the Nation and the needs of its young people.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I would like to say that I am proud of my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee. By their action in restoring \$16 million greatly needed dollars for educational opportunity grants, they have shown an admirable sense of justice and conscience. These are difficult times, it is true, but it is unjust to vent our spleen and attempt false savings in the wrong place, against the wrong people.

Since the \$16 million was cut from educational opportunity grants late last summer, college financial aid officers have had the miserable task of turning away qualified but financially disadvantaged applicants because of lack of funds. In many States and at many colleges, funds available for these grants have been enough to meet only 40 to 60 percent of the need, and sometimes even less than that.

I will give you a couple of examples. Flint Community Junior College, which along with many other community colleges throughout the country has been actively engaged in attracting and training students from disadvantaged families, reports that it will be able to aid only 20 students with educational opportunity grant funds, whereas it really needs sufficient funds to aid 80 students. What will become of the other 60? Delta College in Michigan will suffer the same kind of cut in funds, calls it a disaster and says that with these cuts it will not be able to meet commitments made to the disadvantaged as long as 2 years ago. As one more example, here is the effect of the educational opportunity grant fund cut at Schoolcraft College in Livonia, Mich. This college had requested \$20,000 for educational opportunity grant support for 40 initial-year awards. They now estimate that they will be able to provide this assistance to only nine students.

The restoration of \$16 million for educational opportunity grants will go a long way toward alleviating this problem, and allowing the colleges to carry through with their commitments to the young people in their communities. I sincerely hope that my colleagues in the Senate will permit this restoration to go through and will fight for it in conference.

Mr. President, among the many letters and telegrams I received from Michigan, urging congressional support for the educational opportunity grants program, is one from Mary Konopnick of Mt. Clemens, Mich. Miss Konopnick's letter is so eloquent a testimonial to the value of this program—to the country and to the individual—that I ask unanimous consent that her letter be inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mt. CLEMENS, MICH.,
June 3, 1969.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
Federal Building,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Have you ever wondered just exactly what happens with money that you and other Senators earmark for aid to education? Let me offer myself as an example or "proof of productivity" from these educational bills that you endorse.

My name is Mary Konopnick, I'm 22 years old, a resident of Mt. Clemens, Michigan and a recent graduate of Western Michigan University. I attended my four years at Western almost entirely on federal and state funds. If these funds were not made available to me in the form of loans (National Defense), scholarships (Michigan Higher Assistance Authority Tuition Scholarship and University Scholarships), and Grants (*Educational Opportunity Grant* including the now defunct Government Incentive Award), I would most likely never have attended school or still be in the process of struggling through trying not to become too discouraged.

Instead, today I hold a B.A. Degree and a Secondary Provisional Teaching Certificate. My immediate plans (if I can Manage financially) are to attend Medill Graduate School of Journalism at Northwestern University in June.

During the past four years, I feel that I have put government funds to good use by being on the Dean's List for six semesters, by being admitted to a Freshman Woman's Honorary Society, by being inducted into a national Educational Honorary Society (Kappa Delta Pi), by working at the Job Corps in Battle Creek (scholarship funds made it possible for me to hold down only a part-time job giving me more free time to participate in worthwhile programs) and by graduating cum laude.

I recognize the necessity of education in our society today and am most appreciative that I was able to secure a good start on one with your and the government's aid. You may be sure that I totally support any educational bills or programs which allocate funds to universities to be used to provide students with financial aid to complete their education. I hope that you, also, will give your support to continue such programs and to inaugurate new ones. Thank you.

Sincerely,

MARY KONOPNICK.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, it is a tribute to the good judgment of the Appropriations Committee that the supplemental bill provides for the restoration of \$16 million in educational opportunity grants for disadvantaged college students. The committee's action will increase the number of initial-year awards for the next academic year from 100,200 under the \$124,600,000 now available to 132,000. Although this is less than the 140,500 first-year awards in the 1968-69 academic year, it is a step in the right direction. I believe firmly in the goals that the EOG program is designed to fulfill.

In our complicated, credential-oriented society, there can be no frustration so damaging or debilitating as to be denied access to a college education. That there are still people in this country unable to attend a college or university simply because of a lack of the necessary finances is a blight on our social conscience. If equality of opportunity is to be more than a cliché, or a hollow and cynical catchword, the Government has a responsibility to guarantee a fair start for those who suffer from social and economic inequities not of their own creation.

By now most colleges and universities have begun vigorous recruiting efforts among the disadvantaged. College enrollments will increase by approximately 3 million students during the next decade. Many of these will come from economically deprived backgrounds, and they will require financial assistance in order to meet the increasing costs of higher education. At the same time, universities themselves are becoming more and more hard pressed financially, and the number of institutions with any discretionary funds to use for student aid purposes on those occasions when Federal programs are curtailed, or fail to keep pace with the need, is rapidly diminishing. The combination of increased enrollments generally, a larger proportion of students from disadvantaged backgrounds, and a leveling off or reduction in student aid support, is creating a squeeze on colleges, and cannot fail to create disillusionment and despair among many deprived young people.

The principle of guaranteeing equal educational opportunity, Mr. President, is at all times unassailable. And, at a time of acute social unrest, the failure to act on that principle is simply not very pragmatic. President Nixon has said that he does not want any young man or woman in America to be denied an opportunity for higher education simply because he or she lacks the financial ability. I doubt that anyone in Congress would disagree with that sentiment.

The persons whom the EOG program seeks to help are serious, career-oriented students, many of whom already have the responsibility of providing at least partial support for parents and siblings.

The restoration of this money for the EOG program is a humane and decent gesture. It is also quite practical as an investment in our national well-being.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment that has not been agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 70, after line 3, strike out:

"SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000; *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

"(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$187,900,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount shall be increased

or decreased by the aggregate amount by which the sum of expenditures and net lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser than the sum of expenditures and net lending in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for—

"(1) items designated 'Open-ended programs and fixed costs' in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-first Congress);

"(2) the item designated 'Special Southeast Asia support' in the table appearing on page 27 of that budget; and

"(3) programs of aid to schools in federally impacted areas, under the Acts of September 23 and September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C., chs. 13 and 19).

"(b) The President shall reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations or other obligational authority heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available (including amounts made available to carry out programs to which title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments is applicable), such amounts as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of subsection (a).

"Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1,900,000,000 in expenditures and net lending, below the amounts recommended in the April review of the 1970 Budget, for programs other than those designated in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

"(c) In the administration of any program as to which—

"(1) the amount of expenditures or net lending is limited pursuant to subsection (a), and

"(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution, the amount available for expenditure or obligation (as determined by the President) shall be substituted, in the application of the formula, for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 70, insert the following:

Strike out the colon at the end of line 25 and all that follows through and including line 15 on page 72, and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", except by—

"(1) those expenditures in excess of \$25,400,000,000 that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia,

"(2) those expenditures for interest in excess of the amounts shown for interest in the budget of the United States (H. Doc. 91-15 Part I, Ninety-first Congress) for such fiscal year,

"(3) those expenditures for benefits and services administered by the Veterans' Administration under the provisions of title 38, United States Code, in excess of the amounts shown for such expenditures in such budget for such fiscal year, and

"(4) those expenditures from trust funds established by the Social Security Act, as amended, in excess of the amounts shown for such expenditures in such budget for such fiscal year. For purposes of paragraphs (3) and (4), there shall be taken into account only those expenditures required to be made under laws enacted prior to July 1, 1969.

"(b) To effectuate the provision of subsection (a), the President shall reserve from expenditure such amounts from such appropriations or other obligational authority,

heretofore or hereafter made available, as he may prescribe."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF WILL E. LEONARD, JR.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report favorably from the Committee on Finance the nomination of Will E. Leonard, Jr., of Louisiana, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The term of Mr. Leonard on the Tariff Commission expired yesterday. In order that his service on the Commission might not be interrupted, but be continuous, it is necessary that his nomination be confirmed today. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote on the confirmation of the nomination take place now. In the event that a Senator should wish to object, although I have no knowledge of any objection that might be made, I should be happy to have the action on the nomination reconsidered tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Does the Senator from Louisiana desire that the President be notified of the confirmation of the nomination?

Mr. LONG. No, not at this time. I shall ask for that action tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the recess will not extend beyond 2 p.m. today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

At 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m. the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 p.m. the Senate reconvened, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is ordered.

MEDICARE PAYMENTS AND THE TAX COLLECTOR

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Committee on Finance, in the course of its investigation into medicare and medicaid, has developed a great deal of in-

formation with respect to payments to physicians, dentists, optometrists, and other health-care providers.

We have found that a large number of these people received what appeared to be extremely high payments in 1968. In many instances these large payments may be justified because the individual's practice consists principally of medicare and medicaid recipients. In many instances, however, we are finding that these payments are not justified. For example, we have found medicaid paying quite a few individual practitioners more than \$100,000 in 1968. In one State a general practitioner received \$169,000.

On a combined basis, we find medicare and medicaid paying a total of \$75,000 or more to hundreds and hundreds of physicians. On the medicare side, a prime cause of the high payments is the rapid inflation in medical fees of what Congress thought would be reasonable charges, which has been tolerated and encouraged in the administration and operation of part B of medicare. In many areas of the country, medicare is paying far more for the same service than does Blue Shield under its own most widely held program.

We are also encountering many abuses of the programs, principally in the form of overutilization. For example, a doctor in Florida returned \$25,000 to medicare voluntarily. He decided to do this after an investigation had begun of payments made to him. He contacted the medicare carrier and reported that many of his visits to nursing home patients were really not necessary and that he was going to refund \$25,000, which he thought to be about the amount of his abuse of medicare. Mr. President, I ask that the text of the Florida Blue Shield memorandum on this matter appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are currently doing a mail survey on the above physician in — and the survey letter should have reached Dr. —'s patient Saturday. He was brought to our attention because of his earnings, \$95,856.25, for 1968.

Today, March 31, 1969, Dr. — telephoned me with the information that he was just doing his income tax and he noticed that he had received a large amount of money from Medicare during the past year. He said that he felt bad because he had been billing Medicare for nursing home visits which he felt were not absolutely necessary. He said that he wanted to return to Medicare that part of his payments which he felt were unnecessary.

I tried to reach some type of figure in my own mind, using the Profile books, but they were not accurate because nursing home visits were coded the same as office visits and hospital visits for a long time. In desperation, I totaled up Dr. —'s assigned benefits for the years 1967 and 1968, and I then asked him what percentage of his time was spent in ECF's. With this figure, I then asked him what percent of this time he felt was unnecessary. In rounding off figures, we agreed on a figure of \$25,000 to be paid back to Medicare "S". Dr. — said that he will send this check to my attention within the next week or ten days.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, unfortunately, this situation is not an isolated one. Many carriers and other informed peo-

ple have advised of "gang visits" by physicians to nursing home and hospital patients. This occurs when a physician visits and charges separately for as many as 40 and 50 patients in a single day in the same institution.

More specifically, the Finance Committee has, or shortly will have, the names and addresses of all physicians who were paid more than \$25,000 under medicare. In addition, we have the names and addresses of at least 5,000 health care practitioners who were paid \$25,000 or more under various welfare programs in 1968.

We have learned that many providers know how to effectively milk the medicare and medicaid programs. We have serious reservations, however, as to whether all of that "milk" is being reported to the Federal tax collector.

The Internal Revenue Service contacted the committee to express their interest in the thousands of names and addresses and total payments to those who were paid \$25,000 and more under medicare and medicaid. It was a great surprise to me to learn that none of this information was available to them, but I have since found out the reason. The medicare program permits carriers to employ their own individual identification systems, which all too often resemble nothing more than Swiss bank accounts.

These so-called identification systems function to obscure rather than identify. Social security has had to take months and months trying to get for the committee the names and addresses of the physicians we requested. It is no wonder, then, that the Internal Revenue Service has been frustrated.

Some of us believe that the existing provisions in the Internal Revenue Code require the reporting of payments under medicare and medicaid and any private health insurance program. The Internal Revenue Service is of a similar opinion, but at the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it extended a moratorium on the requirements in the law which it had given earlier to the commercial medical insurance companies.

It is time to put an end to the moratorium. It seems to me that if we require the reporting of \$12 in interest which a hard-working taxpayer receives on his \$300 savings account, equity demands that a \$100,000 payment to a doctor be reported to Internal Revenue Service. In the interest of equity, then, the Finance Committee will turn over to the Internal Revenue Service the many thousands of names and addresses of persons who were paid \$25,000 and more under medicare and medicaid in 1968.

Additionally, we have agreed to turn over to the Internal Revenue Service information we have obtained on "kick-back" arrangements and similar abuses. It seems to this Senator only fair to require full reporting of all payments of income to the tax collector before we even take up the question of tax reform in the Senate.

I am pleased to observe that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) is also upset about the fact that billions of dollars of medicare and medicaid pay-

ments are escaping the tax net. He feels strongly about this, as I do, and he is writing a special amendment, I am informed, to force the reporting of these payments along with private health insurance payments, to the tax collector and to force medicare carriers and intermediaries to abandon the "Swiss bank account" system and use the tax account number—the social security number—as other taxpayers must do.

I must say, Mr. President, that it was the idea of the Senator from Delaware that we should go into this matter; and he, together with the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), felt that the status of the medicare and medicaid programs should be thoroughly explored and evaluated.

While I had predicted that the cost would exceed anything anyone estimated at the time the medicare bill was passed, I never really anticipated that we would find as many abuses as are now being uncovered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his remarks.

In connection with the availability of this information for the use of the Treasury Department, Congress some time ago passed a law requiring every American corporation and every individual making a payment for interest, for wages, or for dividends to report the individuals' social security number or tax number, which are the same. This was done in order to enable the Treasury Department, with the use of computers, to have readily at hand the information as to how much income "Joe Doakes" was receiving from the various sources.

I was very much surprised to learn that the Social Security Department and the health service were not abiding by this law. Certainly, it was not intended that they be exempt.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, they were using code numbers for the doctors in making these payments. I find that medicare would use one code number, and medicaid would use another number; and in some instances where they were running out of numbers they were using a man's telephone number for identification. I asked the question, "Suppose he changes his telephone number two or three times in the year. Would you have three or four numbers for the same man?" It is absolutely ridiculous.

Under existing law, they have the authority to make this correction—not only the authority but I think also the obligation. The law spells out that any payments such as those should bear the social security or tax number of the recipient of the check.

I suggested that if they could not get together promptly on this matter I was going to introduce an amendment which would require that this agency of the U.S. Government abide by the law which is applicable to all other citizens of the country. I understand that they think they can put this into effect by Executive decision. However, I will say this: They

have but a very short time to do it, because if this is not done I shall join the Senator from Louisiana in sponsoring an amendment and attaching it to the first vehicle that comes to the Senate. This policy of using social security numbers for identification makes good common sense in accounting procedures.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as the Senator so well knows, the law requires that when one pays money to someone, he must use his tax number, and the tax number, in most instances, is also the social security number. So if one has money coming from the Government, his claim bears the same number it would if the man owed money to the Government. The number identifies him.

It came to be as a great surprise to find doctors collecting money under other than their tax number or social security number. Then, we find in many instances the public is being overcharged to the extent that in one instance a man being investigated voluntarily wanted to return \$25,000. There have been very serious abuses as I have indicated.

When we tried to find out who got the money we find it is all recorded under coded numbers. Then, we find this method was agreed to by a responsible agency of this Government to permit these coded numbers in instances where people receive large payments. That system has impeded the investigation the Senator wanted to make. I suspect when we get through uncoding the numbers we will find the Government has a large amount of money coming in in taxes in connection with medicare and medicaid.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not only will it have that effect in connection with payments to doctors but also I found that under the existing law, when patients go into nursing homes under medicaid, to the extent they are receiving social security benefits and those social security benefits are not adequate to cover the cost of the nursing homes, first the social security checks go toward defraying the cost with medicaid picking up the remainder. Therefore, it is necessary that they know the amount of the social security payments that "Mr. X" is receiving.

We find that rather than putting these patients in nursing homes and identifying them by their own social security numbers the patients are given a code number. If a patient goes in the nursing home two or three different times he may have a different number each time, and there is no way of knowing if "John Smith" is drawing \$50, \$100, or \$30. This makes it difficult to check whether the money is being properly credited. We found many abuses, not so much on the part of recipients but on the part of nursing homes which are crediting perhaps \$40 from social security whereas in reality they are receiving a check for \$50 or \$60.

This present system is wide open for abuse. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to run down the code numbers to identify all the John Smiths, and by the time the proper John Smith is identified with the correct social security number the trail has almost been lost.

I believe the least they could do would

be to identify everyone by his social security number. I was told they had not thought of that before. Well, they have been reminded of it now, and my patience is running out. If they have not straightened out some of these methods and used a little commonsense on the part of administrative officers I am going to propose the necessary legislation to put an end to it.

Mr. LONG. I was made aware of the fact that the agency which has the responsibility for preventing the Government from being defrauded in paying for the care of aged citizens had requested it, and the Internal Revenue Service permitted this secret code system to be used. I was further dismayed to find that the Internal Revenue Service agreed to this kind of scheme. It seems to me it is a subject that both of them would find great difficulty in justifying.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1104. An act for the relief of Thi Huong Nguyen and her minor child, Minh Linh Nguyen; and

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Chi Jen Feng.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2667) to revise the pay structure of the police force of the National Zoological Park, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the pending amendment would strike from the bill pages 70 through 72, down to line 15, and substitute therefore the text of an amendment which is comparable to the amendment embraced as a part of the Smathers-Williams measure as introduced in the Senate and acted upon last year. That would leave the committee amendment to read as follows:

Section 401(a) expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$187,900,000,000:

I now list the four exceptions in my amendment:

(1) those expenditures in excess of \$25,-400,000,000 that the President may determine are necessary in behalf of our military effort in Southeast Asia.

The figure of \$25.4 billion is arrived at in the same manner as in the committee bill in paragraph 2. It refers to the same figure on page 27 of the 1970 budget submitted by the President, and this section exempts the expenditures in Southeast Asia.

The second section would exempt those expenditures for interest charges which are in excess of the amounts shown for interest in the 1970 budget—House Document 91-15 of the 91st Congress.

Interest charges are exempted because we recognize that the amount of interest can be projected only as an estimate and cannot be determined exactly. It is therefore an uncontrollable item because it is determined by the interest rates in the money market. So this second section would exempt any increase thereof above the amount in the budget.

Third, exemptions proposed are those expenditures for benefits or services administered by the Veterans' Administration under the provisions of title 38 of the United States Code, in excess of the amounts shown for expenditures in such budget and for such fiscal year. These exemptions for veterans' benefits and services are mandatory under existing law; they are obligations of the Government and have to be paid by the Government unless Congress were to pass a law repealing, raising, or lowering them. Otherwise they are fixed charges, and for that reason they are exempt.

The fourth exemption applies to trust funds, such as social security. They would be exempted anyway under our interpretation, but to save any misunderstanding they are specifically exempted. While they can estimate projected expenditures in social security for fiscal 1970 it is conceivable that there could be a larger number of people retiring than is contemplated and, certainly, as they retire they are eligible for retirement benefits. These are paid out of the trust fund payments without any further change by Congress. For that reason payments from these trust funds are exempt.

Other than that, those are the only exceptions that this amendment would allow. The amendment would leave the ceiling of \$187.9 billion as mentioned in the committee bill.

Mr. President, this amendment, which is comparable to what the Senator from Florida and I sponsored last year, in my opinion, should be adopted, because it is most essential that Congress place some control over our spending, especially at a time when we are contemplating raising or extending the 10-percent surcharge for another year.

Certainly if we are only going to extend the tax to raise more money to finance expanding spending programs we would be defeating our purpose in combating inflation. This is the least that Congress should do. If we are going to have a ceiling, then whatever the ceiling may be let us make it a meaningful ceiling, one that has some force in it and one that does not have a lot of automatic escape hatches.

I realize that any ceiling that we approve today, Congress by legislative action can tomorrow or at some subsequent date, modify the ceiling and make an exemption for some agency, as happened in many instances last year. But at least every time it happened it required affirmative action by Congress so that every Member of Congress and our constituencies knew what we were doing and the effect it was having on the overall ceiling.

Now, for a moment let us discuss what is in the committee bill as it was reported—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate. This is a very important amendment we are discussing and I trust that the Chair will require order to be maintained in the Senate, not only on the floor but also in the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Under

BUDGET OUTLAYS
[Fiscal years, in billions]

Controllability	1968 actual	1969 estimate	1970 estimate	Change, 1969 to 1970
Open-ended programs and fixed costs:				
Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds.....	\$35.5	\$39.6	\$42.4	+\$2.9
Interest.....	13.7	15.2	16.0	+.8
Civilian and military pay increase.....			2.8	+\$2.8
Veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance.....	5.0	5.6	5.9	+.2
Public assistance grants (including medicaid).....	5.3	6.3	7.4	+\$1.1
Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation).....	3.2	3.6	3.1	-.5
Postal operations directly related to mail volume.....	.7	.5	.5	0
Legislative and judiciary.....	.3	.4	.4	0
Other.....	1.3	1.6	1.5	-.1
Outlays from prior year contracts and obligations.....	17.3	17.6	18.9	+\$1.3
Subtotal, relatively uncontrollable civilian outlays.....	82.4	90.2	98.8	+\$8.6
Relatively controllable civilian outlays:				
Proposed social security benefit increases.....			1.6	+\$1.6
Other.....	20.5	17.6	19.0	+\$1.5
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions.....	-4.6	-5.1	-5.7	-.6
Total budget outlays.....	178.9	183.7	195.3	+\$11.6

¹ Less than \$50,000,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall relate just what the committee amendment would mean mathematically as to any ceiling.

We start out with the first item—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President may we have order in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Delaware may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the committee starts out with a ceiling of \$187.9 billion before the exception which I have just mentioned. I refer to those open-ended programs on page 16. The first item is "Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds." I might explain that the committee amendment relates the ceiling to the 1969 budget.

The first exemption, social security, is projected at \$39.6 billion for 1969 and \$42.4 billion in 1970, or an increase of \$2.9 billion. Automatically that \$2.9 billion is added to the committee's ceiling of \$187.9 billion, which brings it to \$190.8 billion.

The next exemption is "Interest on the national debt." The 1969 projection was

the bill, the committee amendment, as it was reported, starts out with a ceiling on expenditures and net lending for fiscal 1970 not to exceed \$187,900,000,000. But then, it continues:

Provided, That such amount shall be increased or decreased by aggregate amounts by which the sum of the expenditures and net lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser than the sum of the expenditures and net lending in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

Then it proceeds to the exemptions, the first being items designated "open-ended programs and fixed costs."

These appear on page 16, Budget of the United States, fiscal year 1970—House Document 91-15, part 1, 91st Congress.

Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this tabulation appearing on page 16 of this document under the title of "Open-Ended Programs and Fixed Costs."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

\$15.2 billion. For 1970 it is \$16 billion, or an increase of \$800 million. That \$800 million automatically adds onto this ceiling, bringing it to \$191.6 billion.

The next exemption is "Civilian and military pay increase," and for this there is nothing projected in 1969, but in 1970 there is projected \$2.8 billion, with the result that that is a \$2.8 billion increase. Add that, and we now have a \$194.4 billion ceiling in the committee amendment.

The next exemption is "Veterans' pensions, compensation, and insurance." That adds \$200 million. Add that to the \$194.4 billion and we have a ceiling of \$194.6 billion.

Remember that this is the committee bill which is supposed to have a ceiling of \$187.9 billion.

The next exemption, "Public assistance grants—including medicaid", that item is projected as \$6.3 billion in 1969 and \$7.4 billion in 1970, or an increase of \$1.1 billion. That adds automatically, to the ceiling and we are up to \$195.7 billion.

Now the next item is "Farm price supports—Commodity Credit Corporation," and the budget projects that as \$3.6 billion in 1969 and \$3.1 billion in 1970, or a

reduction of \$500 million which automatically reduced that ceiling figure by \$500 million and brings it back to \$195.2 billion.

The next item is "Postal operations directly related to mail volume," and that is projected as an increase of \$100 million. That brings it back up to \$195.3 billion which, by the way, is now back to the Johnson budget.

Remember all this maneuvering is made under a ceiling first pictured as \$187.9 billion. What a farce.

Then the committee has an exemption for "Legislative and judiciary" but no cost figure is listed.

The committee also lists a classification "Other" which is \$1.6 billion in 1969 and \$1.5 billion in 1970, or a reduction of \$100 million, which brings it back to \$195.2 billion.

Before I leave that section, these increases mentioned are the projected increases between the 1969 and the 1970 budgets as appearing on page 16 of the budget. They would be subject to any further variations in the future as a result of overestimation or underestimation, and they would be subject to any increase or decrease as a result of any newly enacted laws during this Congress in the next 12 months which increased the cost of any specific program in these categories over and above the amount that was projected for the 1970 estimate.

Such an increase would be automatic. Congress would not have to go through the mechanics of changing the ceiling. This is a greased vehicle for freewheel spending.

Also, the President has suggested an increase in postage rates of \$519 million for the next fiscal year. If Congress does not enact the postage increase effective July 1, or to the extent we do not do it next year, that will add another \$519 million to that same ceiling automatically. The committee ceiling rises by our failure to take action.

I may mention that the question was raised earlier as to the effect the proposed user taxes on the airways would have on the ceiling. Whether or not that tax was enacted, it would not affect this ceiling. It would affect the ultimate deficit at the end of the year. Now we are back to the \$195.7 billion ceiling.

I now discuss the next section, part 2 of the bill as reported to the committee. This exempts the item designated "Special Southeast Asia support" in the table appearing on page 27 of that budget. If we turn to page 27 of the budget we will find that this cost is projected as \$28.8 billion in 1969 and \$25.4 billion in 1970, which is a reduction of \$3.4 billion.

So we would subtract that from the ceiling which we built up with these other additions. So then we are back to a \$192.3 billion ceiling because that item would automatically subtract from the ceiling just as if we increased it it would automatically increase the ceiling.

Then, exemption 3 under the committee bill exempts programs for aid to schools in federally impacted areas. I do not have the exact figure, but I understand it to be \$100 million to \$200 million. Whatever may be involved over and above the amount projected in the budget that, too, represents an automatic increase.

I have been unable to get an analysis of the exemptions on page 72, which deal with the lending amounts. So I will ignore those at this point. I am not sure how much they would add. I am sure they would not subtract because the trend is not in that direction.

These statistics prove that under the committee bill there is no ceiling on any of the items which I have mentioned. Conceivably Congress could expand the cost of these items by \$10 billion next year if it wanted to. If Congress did so and the President signed the bills, that would automatically increase the ceiling without any further action of Congress.

For example, if Congress decided to raise salaries for postal employees, as is being suggested, to the extent that those salaries would be increased it would automatically be projected as an increase in the debt ceiling without any further action by the Congress or any reference thereto.

In my own opinion, if we are to have a deficit ceiling, we should have an effective one.

There is one factor about the bill as reported by the committee which should be pointed out because it does take affirmative action. I read the language at the bottom of page 71 of the bill:

Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1,900,000,000 in expenditures and net lending, below the amounts recommended in the April review of the 1970 budget . . .

If it stopped right there it would have more effect, but it continues—

for programs are other than those designated in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

And those are all the loophole exemptions to which I have referred, which open the barn door all the way. If the committee bill is approved Congress would have opened the doors on spending at both ends of the barn and propped them wide open. Congress could expand spending by \$8 billion or \$10 billion more in these areas, and the ceiling would automatically rise to cover.

I do not think there is any disagreement between the chairman of the committee and myself as to this interpretation. There may be disagreement as to which ceiling should be imposed.

Assuming that the departments all through the Government practiced the most rigid economy possible, I grant that the ceiling would have the effect that the committee version of the bill provides, but if we assume that, we would not need a ceiling. We are putting a ceiling in this bill to make sure that spending is curtailed. If we need a ceiling at all let us have an effective ceiling. If we are going to have an effective ceiling then let us pass a bill that has some controls in it. If we are not then let us abolish the whole procedure, and let everybody know that there are no spending controls contemplated.

The argument may be made, "Well, if you accept the iron-clad ceiling you have suggested here, comparable to what we had last year, you are delegating to the President a lot of responsibility that should be discharged by the Congress."

I disagree completely with that argument, and I point out that the situation here today is exactly what it was when we made the same proposal last year. Congress has not yet acted on a single appropriation bill for any department, not one. As we act on the appropriation bills in the weeks and months that lie ahead we can, if we wish, and we should, spell out in each appropriation bill that portion of this reduction in expenditures that we want made in fiscal 1970. If we spell out every one of them in the bills as we act on them later there will be nothing left for the President to cut. However, if Congress does not spell out the reductions, if we neglect our responsibilities as we act on the appropriation bills in the weeks and months ahead then the responsibility is delegated to the President to do that which the Congress failed to do.

I hope that this amendment will be accepted.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the Senator indicate the amounts involved in the four items which would be exempted under his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The social security trust funds would be exempted for \$2.9 billion above the 1969 figure.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In what amount?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is estimated at \$42.4 billion. The interest on the national debt, assuming it is the same as the budget figure, would be \$800 million above the \$15.2 billion 1969 estimate that would be exempted. The figure for veterans' pensions and services is \$200 million above the 1969 estimate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. And what would be the totals in each of the four categories? For example, in the Senator's amendment, he states the total for South Vietnam—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is \$2.9 billion, and then add the \$800 million and the Veterans' Administration item of \$200 million. That is \$3.9 billion, and then, if you go over on page 27 for the Vietnam war cost that is a minus figure, as the Senator knows, from \$28.8 billion in 1969 to \$25.4 billion for 1970. With that subtraction there would be a difference of \$500 million allowed on these four exemptions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator's amendment reads as follows, in part:

Those expenditures for interest in excess of the amounts shown for interest in the budget of the United States.

What is the amounts shown for interest?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. \$16 billion; it is shown in the budget at \$15.2 billion in 1969 and projected at \$16 billion in 1970. The additional amount that interest rates rise or fall as a result of fluctuations in the cost of interest would be exempted, because after all, we are not going to let the Government default on the interest on any of its bonds.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Now, Mr. President, will the Senator indicate the amount involved in paragraph 3 of his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is estimated in the budget as \$200 million above the 1969 figure of \$5.6 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, that is not the figure I am asking for. "Those expenditures for benefits and services, in excess of the amounts shown for such expenditures." What are the amounts shown for such expenditures in the budget?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. \$200 million. It is shown as \$5.6 billion in 1969, and \$5.9 billion in 1970.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Then the figure would be \$5.9 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And it carries it out as \$200 million. It looks like it would be \$300 million, but I understand the rounded figures would come back to the \$200 million.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But as I understand, the Senator is saying expenditures in excess of \$5.9 billion would be exempted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The reason for that would be this—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am not asking for the reason just now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. All right.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. What is the figure the Senator is using for paragraph 4, "In excess of the amounts shown"? What amount does the Senator have in mind?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. These are the trust funds. It is shown in the 1969 budget as \$39.6 billion and in the 1970 budget as \$42.4 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So the figure the Senator has in mind is \$42.4 billion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the figure in the budget.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is \$42.4 billion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the total amount of the items which would be exempted under the Senator's amendment from the limitation is \$89.7 billion, as against \$106.7 billion in the provision agreed to by the Senate committee.

Although I have difficulty in following some of the figures in the Senator's amendment, simply because the figures that I am using have been secured from the Bureau of the Budget as of May 20th, and do constitute later figures—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If I may finish my sentence first.

The intent of the Senator's amendment is clear. Specifically, he would provide for an increase in the limitation on outlays for only four items; Southeast Asia support; interest on the national debt; veterans insurance, compensation, and pensions; and payments from trust funds established under the Social Security Act.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I merely wish to say that the budget figures are the same figures referred to in the committee bill. But the net result, whichever figures we use, would be identical

because when we are exempting these items; they would be exempted. So it would not make any difference on that point which figures we are using. But for the sake of pinning it down I used the budget figures, and we had used them last year. As the Senator knows, these May 20 figures are just figures given to him as of that date, and they may be different from the figures as of May 21.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Well, that is true. But the figure for social security that I am using is \$42.1 billion. That is the figure which, according to the Bureau of the Budget, the total expenditure will be for social security, medicare, and so forth, in fiscal year 1970.

The Senator's amendment would exempt everything in excess of \$42.4 billion for that item, as I understand it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Again I point out to the Senator that although \$42.4 billion is the figure in the budget, it would be the same identical answer, to a penny, whether you use \$42.4 billion or \$42 billion even, for this reason: What we are doing is saying that those social security recipients when they get ready to retire, having paid into the social security trust fund, have a right to draw their retirement, and we would not want to come up the last month of the fiscal year and say, "We have hit the ceiling, and you cannot draw your check until next year."

These are trust funds, separate from the general revenues of the U.S. Government. They are separate under the law, and they should be treated separately under the law. I repeat what I have said on many earlier occasions, no administration has a right to count accumulations in those trust funds as normal receipts for the purpose of deceiving the American people that they have a balanced budget. That has nothing to do with this debate today, but it needed to be said again.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator would exempt four items. I have already named them, as he has named them. But I call to the attention of Senators that there are a large number of mandatory items in addition to these four, for which the Senator's proposal would make no allowance.

First, why are payments from the Civil Service retirement fund less mandatory than those from the social security trust fund? And how about railroad retirement trust fund payments? Why are they less mandatory than payments from the social security trust fund? And Foreign Service retirement trust fund payments; why are they less mandatory than those from the social security trust fund? The Committee bill exempts these items but the Senator's amendment, as written, does not.

Second, grants to States for public assistance are determined by the same Social Security Act that determines the trust fund payments. The Senator from Delaware would exempt from the limitation those grants, including medicaid, depending on State law and on State

caseloads, that qualify under that act, and they have proved in the past to be unpredictable. Since we removed them from budgetary control in a specific statute, it behooves us, I think, to similarly allow for them in this expenditure limitation and the committee bill does this. But the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware does not.

Third. Grants for vocational rehabilitation services, under existing law, also depend upon State laws and State caseloads. The committee bill accommodates any change in these factors, while the Senator's proposal does not.

Fourth. Mail volume. Mail volume is unpredictable; but the desire of the Senate to see that the mail is delivered promptly, 6 days every week, is certain and is predictable.

Last year the Senate overwhelmingly exempted postal field service employees from the three-out-of-four personnel limit because it wanted to assure prompt delivery of the mail, and the House accepted the Senate amendment in conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will withhold his request for a minute, I shall be glad to yield.

Recognizing this policy of the Senate, the committee bill would allow the expenditure limit to change if mail volume requires a corresponding change in expenditures related to the delivery of the mail. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware would make no such provision.

Fifth. Farm price support payments are now mandatory for fiscal 1970 under the existing law. And while that would be subject to special control through modification of legislation, the present legislation extends through calendar year 1970 and controls the actions of both the Secretary of Agriculture and the President.

Price support decisions that will lead to fiscal year 1970 outlays were generally made by President Johnson except for final decision on certain products. Outlays in fiscal year 1970 from these program decisions that have already been made under present law are in fact uncontrollable from the budgetary standpoint, and they are certainly unpredictable. Their magnitude can be greatly affected by weather conditions, changes in exports, changes in domestic demands, and other uncontrollable factors affecting the size of the crop and affecting the supply and demand factors.

The committee provision recognizes this fact, but the Senator's amendment does not do so.

Finally, there are many smaller programs for which outlays are mandatory under existing law. Examples include annual contributions for low-rent public housing, those annual contributions for section 235 ad section 236 of the Housing Act of last year, and also claims and judgments against the United States.

These are mandatory items, and the committee bill recognizes that fact and exempts them. However, the amendment

of the Senator from Delaware does not do so.

Many of these items are unpredictable. Many of them are mandatory. By allowing for a change in the spending limitation only for the four items which he specifically cites, the Senator from Delaware certainly does not imply that we should hold the expenditures for other mandatory payments to the amounts budgeted by President Nixon.

I am sure the Senator recognizes that under the law we cannot do this, whether it is for farm price support payments, civil service retirement benefits, unemployment compensation, payments for Federal employees and ex-servicemen, public assistance grants to the States, or many others. However, the amendment does require that we find offsetting reductions in the controllable programs for which payments are not mandatory under present law. This not only creates a great deal of uncertainty as to what Congress and the President will have to do and when we will know what it is that we have to do, but it could cause the President to make cuts to live within the limitation that we in Congress would object to strongly and that the President himself would find highly undesirable.

The committee bill would force at least \$1.9 billion in spending reductions in the controllable programs. The Senator's amendment would cut \$5 billion, as I understand his amendment. However, if the present estimates turn out to be too low—as they have for mandatory payments many times in recent years—the required reduction could be much larger. And the only place that the President could make such large reductions would be in defense spending.

An overall expenditure limitation is not the way to force extremely large cuts in defense spending, because too much is at stake.

I trust that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief, because I desire to have a vote on the amendment soon.

First, the Senator from West Virginia points out that my amendment does not specifically refer to the railroad retirement trust fund or the civil service trust fund and that payments from those funds are equally mandatory. He is correct. But the same argument can be used against the committee amendment: it likewise does not refer to them. However, to clarify the situation, both are automatically covered because unless Congress by affirmative action restricts directly the expenditures from the railroad retirement fund, the civil service fund, the social security trust fund, or other such trust funds payments will be made automatically by the trustees of those funds.

So I have provided in my amendment the same exemption of the trust funds as the Senator from West Virginia has.

The social security fund was specifically exempted last year, not because we were advised that that was necessary—in fact, we were told that it was automatically excluded—but because we had experienced a situation earlier when the executive branch was asking for an in-

crease in the debt ceiling and the President felt that Congress would not give him as much as he wanted, deferred social security checks were used as a threat.

I remember the Secretary of the Treasury stating on that occasion that if the debt ceiling were not raised by a certain time social security payments would have to be held up at the end of the month. That was not true. There was not a word of truth in that threat because those payments are made from the trust fund. Nevertheless, his statement scared a great many people.

To avoid such a situation the former Senator from Florida, Mr. Smathers, and I included an exemption for the social security trust fund.

Neither the civil service retirement fund nor the railroad retirement trust fund is mentioned in the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia or in my amendment, but I am perfectly willing to have both of them mentioned because they are not affected either way.

However, the Senator is correct as to the price support program and to other programs under the Commodity Credit Corporation; they are not exempted under my amendment, nor is any other program administered or affected by public assistance grants, including medicaid. I may say, incidentally that, based on a preliminary investigation by the Committee on Finance great savings can be achieved in medicaid and improved service provided at the same time.

Likewise, the postal operations are not exempted by my amendment, but all these are exempted under the Senator's amendment. The Senator from West Virginia related the experience Congress had last year with the Post Office Department. Senators will remember that. We were told by postal officials that they were going to discontinue postal deliveries in cities on Saturdays, that they were going to cut back on some rural carrier services, that they were going to close some post offices; in fact, we were threatened that the whole postal service was going to collapse if Congress did not exempt that agency before that week was ended. That was toward the end of July; as I recall, less than 10 days remained in the month.

Congress acceded to the threat and exempted the Post Office Department.

Later I learned that the Postmaster General had padded his payroll with some 20,000 additional employees in the 30 days before he made the threat. The number of postal employees on that date was at an all-time high. The Postmaster General had more employees than he knew what to do with. In fact, I said that they must have gone fishing or perhaps were playing pinochle as the reason we were getting such slow delivery of mail both before and after the Postmaster General employed the extra personnel.

I am not intimidated by those bureaucrats who say, "We are going to shut down our agency if we do not get more money." If they cannot operate their agencies efficiently they should submit their resignations, and I would

be glad to help find replacements—and that goes for their resignations regardless of their political affiliation. I am getting a little tired of this type of bureaucracy that is continuously finding more and more ways of spending money, yet finding more and more excuses for not saving money. Many of those bureaucrats have never known what it is to meet a payroll or go out and make a living in private industry. I think it would be a good experience for some of them. After all, even if we approve and hold the ceiling as proposed under my amendment the Government would still be spending nearly \$6 billion more than is allowed in the ceiling of last year, and that certainly is not cutting it back unrealistically.

As I said before, payments from these trust funds are not affected, and they should not be affected by either of our amendments. The only way we could affect the social security payments, the civil service retirement payments, or the railroad retirement payments would be to change the law. Certainly we could do that at any time, but that is not proposed. There is no disagreement between the Senator from West Virginia and me as to what is being exempted. My amendment as compared to the committee bill, would strike from the exempted list—I do not want any misunderstanding—many of those items appearing on page 16 of the budget which are exempted by the committee amendment, and I will enumerate them: Public assistance grants, including medicaid; farm price supports and all expenditures under Commodity Credit Corporation; the postal operations directly related to mail volume or otherwise. The legislative branch would not be exempted under my amendment, nor would the judiciary.

The point is that whatever ceiling we agree upon should be a realistic figure, and if later Congress wants to change these exemptions let us do it affirmatively and let everybody know what we are doing.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia. He has been very fair in explaining his amendment. I think he is accurate in his explanation of his amendment, and I, too, have tried to explain mine as I think it will work. We are not trying to kid anybody. The issue is very clear as to which amendment we want. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to proceed to a vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator maintain that under his amendment railroad retirement, civil service retirement, and foreign service retirement would be exempted?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. At the time we drafted the amendment last year we were advised by the counsel that it was not necessary to mention these trust fund payments for the retirement benefits. That included social security, the medicare payments, insurance funds, and the civil service retirement fund. For that reason we did not mention them.

Later, the alarming statement was made by the former Secretary of the Treasury that if Congress did not act on the debt ceiling by a certain date so-

cial security recipients might not receive their checks, and that statement got a lot of people unduly excited. To make sure that did not happen again the amendment stated clearly that they are not affected. The question had not arisen on the other funds. I would have no objection to spelling it out for them also.

They do not need to be spelled out in here, but they are not covered. They are automatically exempt.

I will say, further, that neither the railroad retirement nor the civil service retirement is mentioned under the Senator's amendment. However, in my opinion that, too, is not necessary because they are automatically covered, whether they are mentioned or not. So I do not think there is any point of dissension about that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator's amendment on this point reads as follows:

Those expenditures which are trust funds established by the Social Security Act as amended.

Now I ask the further question: Were railroad retirement, civil service retirement, and the Foreign Service retirement programs established by the Social Security Act as amended?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, they were not, and they are not under the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, either; because on page 16 they refer to social security and other social insurance funds, which are medicare, disability, and so forth. They are exempted just the same. They are not mentioned in either of the items we are covering here. It is not necessary. However, if the Senator wanted to spell that out I would have no objection, but I say that it should be spelled out in both amendments. I do not think it is necessary. I would be willing to vote on this with the clear understanding that they are exempted, the same as social security, or we can spell it out.

For example, if the civil service retirement projected expenditures for 1970 at a figure and suppose retirements were to accelerate toward the end of the year, certainly as these people who are eligible for retirement elect to retire there is nothing in here to prohibit them, either under my amendment or under the amendment from the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want the floor in my own right.

The Senator is mistaken. I know that he intends to include the railroad retirement trust fund, the civil service retirement trust fund, and the foreign service retirement trust fund. But I believe he is mistaken. I do not think the language in the amendment as written would do that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct—the language does not do it. It is automatic by law. There is no language in the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia that excludes them, either.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on that point, the language in my amendment does exclude them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Will the Senator show it?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes; I will be glad to.

On page 71 of the bill, on line 6, the items exempted under the committee approach are identified, and they are identified as follows:

Items designated "Open-ended programs and fixed costs" in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States. . . .

On page 16 of the budget of the United States, the item reads as follows:

Social Security, Medicare, and other Social Insurance trust funds.

I emphasize the words "and other social insurance trust funds."

It is all inclusive of foreign service, civil service, and railroad retirement. So under the language of the committee bill, all these social insurance trust funds are clearly included. The Senator intends that they be included under his amendment, but according to the clear language of his amendment, as it now appears, I am constrained to believe that they would be omitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will not quarrel with the Senator because there is no difference in the objective. I think he will find social security and medicare, and the other insurance trust funds refer to the disability insurance, medicare, and the unemployment insurance, which do come under the category of the Social Security department; and I think the Senator will admit that in discussing this we have referred to the item which was the all-inclusive item. I will not debate the point because they are covered anyway.

However, Mr. President, in order to make sure of it I will modify my amendment in paragraph 4 to read as follows where it reads:

Those expenditures from trust funds established by the Social Security Act as amended.

Insert this language:

The Railroad Retirement Fund, the Civil Service Retirement Fund, and the Foreign Service Retirement Act.

I so modify the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BELLMON in the chair). The amendment is so modified.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Now that does include it, but it was unnecessary. I am not debating this point because there is no doubt in my mind that the Senator's committee amendment likewise covers it. I do not think it covers it under the language to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred. That is my understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the modification to the desk?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In just a moment.

I do not think there was any question but that they were covered and that it was not at all necessary to put that paragraph in because it would automatically be covered whether we did or not. But as I stated before, I have no objection to relieving the doubts.

I would like to suggest the absence of a quorum and send the modified language to the desk.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I suggest the Senator from New Hampshire proceed at this time, and the Senator can then send his modifications to the desk.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator wishes to discuss a matter I yield the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have only a few words to say, but I would like to say them now while certain amendments are being cleared up at the desk.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Senators would like to hear the words of the distinguished Senator. May we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I regret that illness in the family made it completely impossible for me to be present when this supplemental bill was marked up last Friday, so that I did not have the opportunity to make this statement in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. President, there is no one in the Senate who has had a more consistent record over an extended number of years of trying to hold down appropriations than the Senator from New Hampshire. However, I want to say today what I said last year when we had a different President. This is not a partisan position, because I made this statement in relation to President Johnson and I am now saying the same thing with relation to President Nixon.

I wonder when the Congress and its Appropriation Committees are going to face up to their own jobs and their own tasks, and do the cutting themselves rather than to try by artificial means to get a general cut in the appropriations, and to pass on to the President of the United States to choose where the cuts shall be made.

Mr. President, one of the few powers that Congress has is the power to control the purse. If we have lost control not only of the purse but of ourselves, if we cannot perform and do not dare to try to perform the functions of Congress, then, it is indeed a discouraging situation.

What are we doing here today? We are writing into a supplemental bill, a supplemental bill dealing with deficits in fiscal year 1969, a ceiling for fiscal year 1970, which does not start until next month. In a sense we are tying our own hands in advance, and doing it almost casually in connection with a supplemental bill.

Everyone knows what is bound to happen. It has happened under Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents. It is bound to happen again as it happened last year. Congress said to the President that we wanted to cut the national budget by so many billions of dollars. We told him to do the cutting, and he did it. Where did he do it? He did it, as has been the time-honored practice, in some of the most sensitive areas; areas that would arouse the people. Then, pretty soon we began to have thundering at our doors by people who are upset because they were not going to get their

impacted school funds, because they were not going to get their school milk money, or they were not going to get their school lunch money, or they were not going to get some of the other items, smaller items to be sure, but items having a great impact.

I cannot guarantee that the present President will not do the same as former Presidents have done. The Senator from New Hampshire has fought, bled, and died to get a few million dollars for title III funds under the National Defense Education Act, which are matched by the States, and which every superintendent of schools and every principal or headmaster of high schools in my State, and I suspect in other States, is anxious to obtain.

If the amendments of the distinguished Senator from Delaware are adopted they would foreclose our doing anything about the language at the House which provided that certain educational funds should not be interfered with. We would foreclose in advance much of the power of the Committee on Appropriations and much of the power of Congress.

Mr. President, certainly the Senator from New Hampshire could never be characterized as a dove, but people are aroused and they expect action in relation to the Vietnam question, which is the most sensitive question before this country—the matter of extricating ourselves from Vietnam. We can make speeches on the floor of the Senate from now until doomsday but they will accomplish little. There will come a time within the next few months when we will be writing the military appropriation bill, and there will come a time when we may be able to exert some influence on the military or the administration by judicious handling of these appropriations. One might say that there is not much that we can do so long as we have boys in Vietnam. We cannot vote against feeding them or arming them. But I am not talking about that. I am talking about the constant running debate concerning military appropriations and the charge that Congress and its committees on appropriations have not sufficiently scrutinized them and put to the test military appropriations.

All of these things lie before us and we are here today trying, in one fell swoop, to surrender and pass into the hands of the President the duty of making the decisions that we either do not dare or do not have the intestinal fortitude to make for ourselves. If the Congress has fallen to that point it does not make such difference what we do here today because we have completely lost control; we have lost control of the Government and we have lost control of our own sworn duty.

I cannot vote for the amendments of the distinguished Senator from Delaware as much as I admire his motives, and his desire to economize and save the taxpayers' money. As a matter of fact, so far as I am concerned, I am strongly tempted not to vote for the appropriation bill itself if it carries in it the dashed-off agreement on a fixed ceiling, without thought as to where cuts are going to be taken, and simply should

der onto the Executive downtown the sworn duty of Congress.

As the appropriation bills come before the Senate, one by one, I want a chance for us to do our own economizing and to decide ourselves where cuts are to be made.

As Senators know, the people of this country are becoming aroused. We are in a different situation now than we have been for a long time. There is a taxpayers' revolt. Our people are alert. Aroused constituencies are aware of the situation that we should be facing up to. I do not like to nonchalantly throw this important duty aside.

Mr. President, I am not inconsistent in this because when the first attempt to impose spending ceilings was made last year, coupled with the 10-percent surtax, I voted against the whole thing, even though I felt that the tax was necessary. I did so because I could not and did not—and said so on the floor of the Senate with relation to President Johnson, just as I say it today—believe that we were justified in evading our responsibilities and placing them on the shoulders of the President of the United States. I did not think that was the intelligent way to handle the problem and I was positive it would come back to haunt us in the months ahead—as it most certainly did.

If the amendment of the Senator from Delaware is adopted, even if the amendments of my good friend on the Appropriations Committee who is guiding this bill on the floor at the present time, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), are added, in a sense we will have foreclosed the opportunity to use careful and discriminating judgment in where to cut. There are certainly many places that cuts can be made but I do not like to turn over to the President of the United States and his Cabinet, the Pentagon, or someone else, the power to select where such cuts shall be made.

Mr. President, I hope that somewhere between here and the committee on conference—I wish it could be here, but I do not deceive or delude myself—that somewhere along the line in this appropriations process we could stand up and face up to our own responsibilities. We should not just make a lump sum appropriation, throw it into the President's lap, and say, "Cut it by so much. Cut it wherever you like," and then in a few months begin to scream, to groan, and to shout because it was cut where we as individual Senators did not like.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from West Virginia yield for a few questions?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I should like to get a better understanding of the total figure which the outgoing President Johnson submitted in his budget, and then, as I recall, in President Nixon's submitted revised budget and then today the distinguished Senator from West Virginia mentioned the latest revision, I believe, dated May 20.

My question to the Senator from West Virginia is: What is the total new obligatory authority as of May 20?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The answer is \$205.9 billion.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has the figure originally submitted by the outgoing President Johnson which would compare with that?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is \$211.4 billion.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. And then the one final figure, the original Nixon revised budget?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is the same figure, \$205.9 billion.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. It is \$205.9 billion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Now, as I recall, during debate today, the item of total interest on the national debt was mentioned. I am not clear whether it is \$16 billion, which is the figure I recollect as being in the budget, or whether it is \$16.4 billion, because I think the \$16.4 billion figure was mentioned by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is \$16.4 billion, as of May 20.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. So there has been a revision up to date of \$400 million in that item, since the original budget was submitted, I take it; is that not correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The figure as of May 20 was \$16.4 billion.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Now, can the Senator give me the social security trust fund figure, is it \$42.1 billion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct, as of May 20, for social security, including medicare and other social insurance trust funds.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Now, does the Senator have handy the social security trust fund figure in the original budget?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No. I do not have that figure.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Does the Senator have available the other trust fund figures, of which the highway trust fund, I presume, would be the largest other than the social security trust fund? What do the other trust funds add up to?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do not have the revised figures for that specific item.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Now may I put a question to the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), and will he yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, is the Senator from Virginia correct that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware is identical to or substantially identical to the legislation enacted by the Senate last year when it approved the 10-percent surtax?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is substantially identical to the amendment that was passed by the Senate. However, in the conference it was modified, and some exemptions were put in which were not in the Senate's amendment. But the amendment I have offered is identical to

the amendment—I have the old bill before me—except that we changed the figure for the ceiling to bring it up to date, and use the same figure offered by the Senator from West Virginia and his committee. Other than that, it is identical right down the line. We just change the effective dates. It has the same effective as the so-called Williams-Smathers package offered on March 8, 1968.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. If the Williams amendment were adopted today, would it conform to the language of legislation which accompanied the 10-percent surcharge?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am ready to vote. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute before the vote comes up on my amendment.

The suggestion has been made that acceptance of this amendment would be a delegation of the authority of Congress to the President. I remarked earlier in my statement that as of this date not a single appropriation bill for any agency of the Government or any department thereof has as yet been acted on for 1970. So every one of them will be before us. Even if it accepted this ceiling Congress could yet make its selective cuts in the various appropriation bills as they come before us in the weeks ahead. To the extent that we did that, we would be delegating no authority to the President. To the extent that we failed to do it we would delegate to the President that authority which we had failed to exercise.

As to the question of why this amendment should be offered to the supplemental appropriation bill, the committee also has an amendment in that bill, and my amendment is merely a substitute therefor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. What the Senator's amendment does do, however, is that, regardless of the action of the Appropriations Committees, the Appropriations Committees are compelled to meet automatically a ceiling that is set down today for all the appropriation bills for 1970, no matter what may occur?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. It would be a ceiling hanging over the heads of the Appropriations Committee as it acted on the appropriation bills in the months ahead. There is no argument about that, and it was so intended.

Mr. COTTON. But the ceiling laid down last year was not quite the same.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As originally offered, yes. However, later it was amended, and as the Senator knows, I strenuously resisted the effort in many of the changes. As I stated earlier, if we adopt a ceiling I recognize that conceivably Congress could amend the ceiling, change it, make exceptions. I realize that, but if we are going to have a ceiling let us have one that Congress would have to change by affirmative action.

Mr. COTTON. And the Senator's amendment really amounts to drawing a very fine New Year's resolution on the part of all of us to save the taxpayers money?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator states it well. In the light of the fact that this Congress and our executive branch together have been living beyond their income to the extent that they have for the past several years and in the light of the fact that we are operating right now at a deficit of \$500 million a month more than we are taking in, I would say the answer to that question is "Yes." Perhaps a resolution by Congress that we are going to try to save the taxpayers some money is overdue. I welcome that interpretation.

Mr. COTTON. I agree thoroughly with the Senator's suggestion. I agree that the time has come to make the resolution and keep it. But the Senator from New Hampshire, I think, is even older in years than the Senator from Delaware, and I do not know what the experience of the Senator from Delaware has been, but I have very vivid recollections of how effective the new year's resolutions are and how long they last. We have to do this job day by day and week by week. We cannot do it in advance. I remember, when I was a child, that my father gave me an automatic instrument into which I could put dimes. I could not open it until it was full. It was enforced saving. But I found a way to open it within, I think, 2 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. This is a day-to-day operation, and we will have to work in the days to come just as we did before. I realize that Congress can go on a sudden spending spree any time it wants to, tomorrow or the day after. I think the Senator will agree that as the Senator from Delaware saw it he did the best he could, and I assure him that I will continue to do the best I can to stop the spending spree. I was not one who was trying to break the ceiling.

Mr. COTTON. He did exactly that. I commend him for doing it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will assure the Senator that I will continue to try to hold down these expenditures. The time is long overdue when we have to bring our fiscal imbalance into balance. As one who has said we are going to have to continue the surtax, which means an additional tax of \$8 to \$10 billion for the American taxpayers for another 12 months, at the same time I say that if we are going to extend the surtax with no control over our spending I do not think it will achieve the objective we seek. I am trying to achieve the objective of holding down expenditures, and I assure the Senator I will be here tomorrow trying to do it just as I am today.

Mr. COTTON. The Committee on Appropriations, of which the distinguished Senator is not a member, although he always contributes to the cause, has that responsibility, and I have faith in the committee, on which I have served these years.

I think we are thoroughly aware of what we are up against. I would rather like to see the committee be given an opportunity to come in and show what

it can do, without, in advance, before anyone knows what the circumstances are going to be, having the Senate and the Congress give us an ultimatum and give us a set ceiling under which we have to live.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am only saying that I will accept the ceiling figure which the Senator's own committee approved and which is in the bill. I am only trying to write guidelines and to close the built-in loopholes.

The committee proposal for a ceiling with all of the built-in exceptions is in my opinion merely a pious hope. It is worthless as far as controlling expenditures is concerned.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I say, in further response to the inquiries from the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), that when President Nixon revised his budget estimate as of April 15, no new budget document was printed. So far as the printed budget document is concerned, all we have is the one submitted by President Johnson on my birthday, which happens to be January 15, this year.

Now, if I may address my remarks to the matter before the Senate for decision.

We have three proposals from which the Senate will have to choose—at least three. One is the proposal that comes from the House, which, for the time being, I shall disregard. The second is the proposal which was worked out in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The third is the proposal which the Senator from Delaware has offered by way of an amendment.

And so at the moment I would like just briefly to attempt to explain and to distinguish between these two proposals, the one by the Senate committee and the other offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The proposal offered by the Senate committee would reduce the \$192.9 billion figure, presented by the President in his revised budget estimates, by \$5 billion, to the figure of \$187.9 billion.

The committee then would exempt from any forced reduction those items which are considered to be unpredictable, such as support for Southeast Asia; uncontrollable and fixed, such as the interest on the national debt; and open-ended, such as public assistance grants. These items, which would be exempted under the Senate committee recommendation, are estimated to total \$106.7 billion in fiscal year 1970.

Now, the committee bill says that it will exempt these items in 1970 in the amount by which they exceed the expenditure for the same items in fiscal year 1969; they are estimated to total \$103.6 billion in fiscal year 1969, and they are estimated to total, as I have said, \$106.7 billion in 1970.

Therefore, the difference is \$3.1 billion, which would exempt, and this figure is added on to the \$187.9 billion, to make a total of \$191 billion, which would constitute the expenditure ceiling in lieu of the \$192.9 billion.

The Senate committee then nails the reduction down. It says that there must be a reduction of not less than \$1.9 billion in the controllable items—the \$1.9

billion being derived by subtracting from \$192.9 billion, the President's estimate, the \$191 billion, which is the ceiling established by the committee.

Those items that are exempted, and which may up the \$106.7 billion, under the committee bill are these:

Support for Southeast Asia, \$25.2 billion—that is the latest estimate, as of May 20;

Social security and the other social insurance trust funds, including railroad retirement, civil service retirement, Foreign Service retirement, totaling \$42.1 billion—again, the very latest figure;

Interest on the national debt, \$16.4 billion;

Pay increases for military and civilian employees, \$2.8 billion;

Veterans' pensions, compensation, and insurance, \$6.1 billion;

Public assistance grants, including Medicaid, \$7.2 billion;

Farm price supports under the Commodity Credit Corporation, \$3.6 billion;

"Other" items—which would include IDA, the International Development Association, for example, and vocational rehabilitation—in the amount of \$2.1 billion;

Legislative and judiciary, \$4 billion;

Postal operations, depending upon the mail volume, \$5 billion.

I believe there is one more item, amounting to \$4 billion, and that is Federal aid for impacted areas. If I have left out no items, these items should add up to \$106.7 billion which would be exempted under the bill. And these are May 20 estimates, as secured from the Bureau of the Budget.

This would leave \$86.2 billion within which reductions could be made. But the \$86.2 billion, Mr. President, is made up of only two items: Defense, \$52.5 billion, and "other," \$33.7 billion.

So there is where the President and Congress would have to make the cuts. And within that \$86.2 billion, Defense and other, there is \$18.9 billion in prior year contracts and obligations.

This further reduces the area within which cuts can be made to a figure of \$67.3 billion. That is all we have to work from: \$67.3 billion. And the major portion of that is Defense. So, we are working in a pretty small area.

The committee, as I say, would require a reduction of \$1.9 billion. It does not say that the President has to make this cut. It simply says that the President must make this cut if we do not make it. But it does exempt those programs which are mandatory, uncontrollable, unpredictable, fixed, and open ended.

Now, a \$1.9 billion cut is a pretty sizable cut. In fiscal year 1968, Congress reduced appropriations in the amount of \$5.567 billion; but the expenditure impact was only \$1.907 billion. So there is a good example that fits almost into the very picture that we have here today. We are talking about a \$1.9 billion cut in expenditures. What does that mean, when it comes to cutting appropriations? Well, in 1968, it meant a cut in appropriations of \$5.567 billion. That is a pretty sizable cut.

If we consider fiscal year 1969, Congress cut appropriations by \$13.188 billion. But what was the amount of the

expenditure reduction? Just twice what we are trying to achieve here: \$3.803 billion.

Now, we are not bound to stay below the \$1.9 billion figure. Congress can cut more, may I say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. Congress can cut more from that figure if Congress so desires. Congress can cut appropriations to the extent that the expenditure impact would be twice that much, if it wants to. But under the committee bill, Congress and the President would at least know that a reduction of \$1.9 billion is required. I think that the people want to see some kind of responsible reduction made in Federal expenditures. The committee has sought to face up to the need.

Now, the Senator from Delaware would require a \$5 billion cut in expenditures. But if we are to judge from experience, that would require appropriation cuts trebling that amount, or up to \$15 or \$16 billion.

The Senator from Delaware, in addition, exempts only four items. Granted, they amount to about \$89 billion, he exempts only four items. He does not exempt public assistance grants, which were exempted last year up to \$560 million above the budget estimate. He does not exempt farm price supports, which were exempted last year up to \$907 million over the budget estimate. He does not exempt the so-called other items, vocational rehabilitation, the International Development Association—I must admit I voted against that, but it is in the bill—nor does he exempt legislative, for example.

The Senator's amendment would not exclude mandatory pay increases. So, boiled down to its lowest common denominator, the Senator's amendment is unworkable, in that it is too stringent. It would not exempt any of the other items that are just as mandatory, just as uncontrollable and open ended, and just as unpredictable as are the four items exempted; and it would require too deep a cut, one which I think would put the President in an untenable position.

The President has already cut the Johnson budget by \$4 billion; and then, were we to force another \$5 billion, that would make a total of \$9 billion. I do not think the President can live with that.

If Congress wants to make a \$5 billion cut, it can still do it under the committee proposal, but it will not be required to do it, nor will the President be required to do it.

Mr. President, I hope that the able Senator's amendment will be rejected.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator points out that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware proposes cuts of \$5 billion. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The committee version would provide for a reduction of \$1.9 billion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know that. However, it would be \$3.1 billion below President Johnson's budget figures. However, that is not the big difference. The big difference is to the extent that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware provides a mandatory ceiling.

My amendment provides that the ceiling has some teeth in it, and if the amendment is adopted everyone will be on notice that it does mean that the cuts would have to be made or Congress by affirmative action would have to amend the ceiling.

There would be no automatic trigger for the increases as provided by the committee amendment.

I am ready to vote.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia gave the figures in the Nixon budget as \$192.9 billion. What is the figure for the Johnson budget which would compare with that figure?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It would be \$4 billion in excess of that figure.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Does the Senator have the exact figures handy?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It would be \$196.9 billion, \$4 billion in excess of the Nixon budget figure.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) are necessarily absent.

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) is detained on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 80, as follows:

[No. 36 Leg.]

YEAS—16

Allen	Fannin	Saxbe
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Thurmond
Cook	Hansen	Tydings
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Packwood	
Dole	Proxmire	

NAYS—80

Allott	Griffin	Mundt
Baker	Gurney	Murphy
Bayh	Harris	Muskie
Bellmon	Hart	Nelson
Bennett	Hartke	Pastore
Bible	Hatfield	Pearson
Boggs	Holland	Pell
Brooke	Hollings	Percy
Burdick	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hughes	Randolph
Cannon	Inouye	Ribicoff
Case	Jackson	Russell
Church	Javits	Schweiker
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Cranston	Kennedy	Smith
Dirksen	Long	Sparkman
Dodd	Magnuson	Spong
Dominick	McCarthy	Stennis
Eagleton	McClellan	Stevens
Eastland	McGee	Symington
Ellender	McGovern	Talmadge
Ervin	McIntyre	Tower
Fong	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Miller	Yarborough
Goodell	Mondale	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Montoya	Young, Ohio
Gravel	Moss	

NOT VOTING—4

Alken Mansfield Mathias
Anderson

So the modified amendment of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the manager of the pending bill and the distinguished acting majority leader, in view of the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts will probably address the Senate for about 1 hour, and in view of the clock, whether there will be any business transacted after the address by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order in the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was not aware that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was planning to make a speech 1 hour in length. If that is the case, I do not think we should try to press for completion of the pending bill this afternoon. Some Senators have to go to New York and elsewhere for very important reasons. Then, too, there are at least three amendments, if not more, that will require some discussion and possibly a roll-call vote.

However, there is a continuing resolution that we should adopt in the Senate today if 700,000 postal employees are to receive their pay on Thursday, which is in the day after tomorrow. If this continuing resolution is not adopted, these 700,000 employees, I am told, will not be paid. The House of Representatives has already passed the continuing resolution. I think it is incumbent, therefore, upon the Senate likewise to pass the resolution quickly.

If we can complete action on that measure today I do not think we should attempt to do anything further today on the pending bill, by way of any votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the resolution ready to be submitted?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The resolution is ready.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator from Massachusetts yield for that purpose?

Mr. BROOKE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would suggest that the distinguished acting majority leader ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on House Joint Resolution 782.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Joint Resolution 782, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1969, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as I have already explained, unless the Senate adopts this continuing resolution, which was agreed to earlier by the House of Representatives, 700,000 postal employees will not receive their pay on Thursday of this week. The Postmaster General called me earlier today and he is very anxious for the Senate to act, because otherwise he will have no funds to meet his payroll. Here we are 48 hours away from payday for 700,000 postal employees, and I think it is important and imperative that the Senate today adopt the continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 782.

I move the resolution's adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 782) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Missouri may proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

KANSAS CITY DESERVES ADDED SERVICE TO PORTLAND-SEATTLE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity since May 29 to review the decision in the Reopened Pacific Northwest-Southwest Service Investigation and am extremely disappointed that the Civil Aeronautics Board, by a 3-to-2 decision, on that date, again denied the much-needed competitive service between the Kansas City and Portland-Seattle markets.

Based on the statistics presented by city officials and civic leaders in asking reconsideration, it is all too clear that the present carrier—with one round-trip a day between Kansas City and Portland, and one round-trip a day between Kansas City and Seattle—is not providing the level of service merited.

It is significant to note that an examiner for the Civil Aeronautics Board,

on two separate occasions, studied the needs of this market and on both occasions recommended that a competitive carrier be certified for this route. Further, this finding was substantiated by the Board's own staff, the Bureau of Operating Rights.

Based on these findings by the examiner and by the Board staff, it is not only disappointing but difficult to understand why three members of the Board persist in ruling that competitive service not be allowed.

I would hope Kansas City and Portland-Seattle representatives will file again as soon as possible for competitive service; and in the meantime, I would also hope the Senate Commerce Committee will look into the lack of competitive service, and therefore lack of adequate service in this market.

Mr. President, as further example of the feeling in Kansas City as to the inadequacy of present service to the Pacific Northwest, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Kansas City Times of April 5, "An Air Ruling Shorts Kansas City and the Pacific Northwest."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AIR RULING SHORTS KANSAS CITY AND THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

The denial of expanded airline service between Kansas City and the Pacific Northwest by the Civil Aeronautics board is a most unfortunate and, we think, a misguided ruling. This rebuff to the self-considered best interests of both areas actually was executed by three of the CAB's five members. The two others agreed with the CAB's Bureau of Operating Rights and its examiner in the case—that a need exists for additional service on the Kansas City-Portland-Seattle route.

How sharply the 3-man CAB majority departed from the views of those directly concerned can be shown in the following facts:

The city government and the Chamber of Commerce here, after extensive studies of the potential market, requested the additional service to the Northwest.

So did the Pacific Northwest cities directly concerned, including civic and business interests. Seattle's bid also was actively supported by the attorney general of the state of Washington.

There were several applicants for a new connection between the two areas in addition to the route already served by United Air Lines. The choice, if there was to be one, narrowed between Trans World Airlines and Eastern Airlines. After lengthy hearings the CAB examiner recommended T. W. A. instead of Eastern which sought a mandatory stop at Kansas City on its St. Louis-Portland-Seattle route. Both T. W. A. and Eastern are convinced that the desired service is needed and can be made profitable. These hard-headed appraisals are based on economic surveys.

Air traffic is growing spectacularly year after year. Kansas City is one of the few large communities that has invested in a new airport specifically designed to handle the coming jumbo transports and other special requirements of the jet age. Moreover, air congestion is not a problem here as it is at most major aviation centers. Despite its readiness to take on expanded airline activities, Kansas City finds itself being brushed aside by a seemingly indifferent majority of the CAB's present members.

Parties in the case—which is separate from the Trans-Pacific case now under presidential review—can file exceptions to the board's negative ruling. But there is little hope at this time that the viewpoint of the 2-man minority will prevail.

It may be necessary to wait for a more enlightened majority attitude that could come with future changes in the CAB's membership. The problem is that the need for this route exists now. Kansas City and the Pacific Northwest have been badly served by the authority charged with organizing the nation's air network in the public's interest and convenience.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent for insertion in the RECORD of a copy of the petition for reconsideration filed by the city of Kansas City and the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City in the Reopened Pacific Northwest-Southwest Service Investigation, a request that was subsequently denied by the Civil Aeronautics Board on May 29.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Before the Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C., Docket 15459, et al.]

IN THE MATTER OF THE REOPENED PACIFIC NORTHWEST-SOUTHWEST SERVICE INVESTIGATION

(Petition for reconsideration of Order 69-4-11 of the city of Kansas City, Mo., and the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City)

Kansas City is profoundly shocked by the Board majority's indifference to its urgent need for additional competitive service to the Pacific Northwest. After almost five years of proceedings and two Initial Decisions, both of which found a need for competitive service, a majority of the Board has now told Kansas City that it must continue to be the victim of United's extremely poor monopoly service to Seattle and Portland.

The citizens of Kansas City are incensed by this decision because they have gone "all out" to provide a new airport known as Kansas City International Airport, scheduled for opening by June 1, 1970 at an initial investment of more than \$212 million. They are at a loss to understand why the Board (as well as other Federal agencies) would urge communities to expand their ground facilities to accommodate growing passenger traffic, present jets and superjets of the future, and then leave them high and dry. Demoralizing, hardly reflects the feeling in Kansas City. The conclusion of the majority that the Kansas City-Northwest market has no pressing need for competitive service is legally and factually unsupportable and should be reversed.

I. THE KANSAS CITY-SEATTLE/PORTLAND MARKET WILL GENERATE SUBSTANTIAL TRAFFIC WITH PROPER SERVICE AND IS LARGE ENOUGH TO JUSTIFY COMPETITION

In 1967, close to 25,000 O&D and connecting passengers moved between Kansas City and Seattle; another 14,000 such passengers travelled between Kansas City and Portland. Despite extremely poor service by United, traffic increased by about 17 percent over 1966. Using the Board's forecasting methodology employed in its decision—15% annual growth and 20% stimulation, a stimulation far too low in view of the market's underdevelopment—the Kansas City-Seattle market would reach 45,000 passengers by 1970 or 124 daily passengers—a level of traffic well in excess of the Board's 100 daily passenger criterion for competitive service. The Kansas City-Portland market would be close to 26,000 or 71 daily passengers.

The use of only a 20% stimulation factor is manifestly improper in the circumstances here. United operates only a single round trip in each of the markets. On the basis of the traffic experience in the St. Louis-Pacific Northwest markets where the traffic has increased threefold after Eastern's institution

of service, it is not unreasonable to assume that the Kansas City markets in issue would be stimulated between 75% and 100%. Using the lower 75% stimulation factor, the Kansas City-Seattle market in 1970 would amount to 66,000 passengers or 180 daily passengers, the Kansas City-Portland market would reach 37,000 passengers or over 100 daily passengers. These volumes of traffic would clearly support competitive service, especially in view of United's minimal schedule pattern.

Clear evidence of the underdevelopment of Kansas City-Pacific Northwest markets is reflected in the surge of the St. Louis-Pacific Northwest traffic after Eastern's institution of a good pattern of service in the latter market. In 1966, before Eastern's service between St. Louis and the Pacific Northwest, the Kansas City market was 50% larger than the St. Louis market. In 1967, the roles were completely reversed with the St. Louis market being 70% larger.* With the institution of an adequate volume of service in the Kansas City markets, traffic response would be equally as dramatic as that of St. Louis.

We are at a loss to understand the Board's failure to take into account the connecting and beyond traffic that would flow over the Kansas City-Pacific Northwest segments. In its forecast for other markets in its decision, the Board includes connecting traffic, but disregards it in the case of Kansas City. More importantly, the Board's approach to beyond traffic at Kansas City is inconsistent with its approach at St. Louis. In its earlier decision, the Board found that "the ability to provide beyond St. Louis services is the selection for this route." And there is no factor or greatest importance in carrier question that beyond traffic has figured heavily in Eastern's St. Louis-Pacific Northwest operation. It would also be an extremely important element in providing a traffic pool for flights between Kansas City and the Pacific Northwest. Yet the Board ignores the availability of back up traffic in evaluating the Kansas City-Northwest markets' potential. Bearing in mind the emphasis placed by the Board in many other cases on beyond gateway traffic flows, we cannot understand why the Board discriminates here against Kansas City's position as a hub through which substantial volumes of traffic could be attracted enroute to the Pacific Northwest. Furthermore, if the Board's objective to ease congestion at Chicago is ever going to be achieved, then it must turn to opportunities for relief such as Kansas City offers in this proceeding.

There can be no doubt that the traffic potential exists for additional service between Kansas City and the Pacific Northwest. It awaits development by a competitor for United, whose unbelievably poor service record holds out no prospect that the market will ever be adequately served or promoted.

II. UNITED'S SERVICE BETWEEN KANSAS CITY AND THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST HAS BEEN GROSSLY INADEQUATE

United has been authorized to serve the Kansas City-Pacific Northwest markets for over thirteen years. And after this long period of time United today operates but one round trip in each of the two markets, a single nonstop round trip between Seattle and Kansas City and a single non-stop round trip between Kansas City and Portland. For only a brief period in 1967 did one of the markets, Kansas City-Seattle, enjoy the "luxury" of two United flights. Against this background of poor service it is difficult to understand how the Board can conclude that the market receives a reasonable quantum of single-plane service. Moreover, single-

*1967 traffic for St. Louis-Pacific Northwest markets based on last 2 quarters of year and then annualized to compensate for fact that St. Louis-Pacific Northwest service by Eastern did not begin until the middle of the year.

carrier connecting service is extremely limited. As a result it is not surprising to find that in 1967 United carried only 65% of the Kansas City-Seattle traffic and 69.5% of the Kansas City-Portland traffic on a single-carrier basis.

The token service that United gives the Kansas City-Pacific Northwest market would be better not provided at all if it is going to be used by the Board as a reason for not granting badly needed competitive service. The St. Louis-Seattle market now, after less than 2 years of single-plane authorization, received 4 times the number of schedules that the once larger Kansas City-Seattle market receives. Surely Kansas City after thirteen years is entitled to something more than the bare minimum of service that United reluctantly offers. Competitive authority in the market is the only assurance that Kansas City will ever receive improved service to the Pacific Northwest.

CONCLUSION

The Kansas City-Seattle/Portland markets have suffered from more than a decade of negligence and indifference. The future, with only United in the markets, is bleak. Kansas City respectfully submits that competition in these markets is required by the public convenience and necessity.

Respectfully submitted.

HERBERT C. HOFFMAN,
City Counselor.

AARON A. WILSON, Jr.,
Deputy City Counselor.

(Attorneys for Kansas City, Mo., and the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City.)

Dated: April 18, 1969.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have, this day, served a copy of the foregoing Petition for Reconsideration of Order 69-4-11 of the City of Kansas City, Missouri and The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City upon each party of record in this proceeding by mailing a copy thereof, properly addressed, postage prepaid.

Dated at Kansas City, Missouri, this 18th day of April, 1969.

AARON A. WILSON, Jr.,
Deputy City Counselor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent for insertion in the RECORD of a letter from the able mayor of Kansas City, Hon. Ius W. Davis, dated April 24, in which he presents the cogent arguments as to why there should be competitive service between the Kansas City and Portland-Seattle markets.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF KANSAS CITY, Mo.,
April 24, 1969.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: Kansas City urgently requests your support of our motion to the Civil Aeronautics Board for reconsideration of their recent decision rejecting competitive air service between Kansas City and the Pacific Northwest. Their adverse decision in the Reopened Pacific Northwest-Southwest Service Investigation, Docket 15459 et al, was a severe blow to the citizens of Kansas City.

This proceeding has gone on for almost five years and has included the Initial Decisions of two examiners, both of whom found a need for competitive service in these markets (Kansas City-Seattle-Portland). The only carrier serving Kansas City and the Pacific Northwest at the present time is United Airlines. After more than thirteen years United today operates but

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 19, 1969
For actions of June 18, 1969
91st 1st - No. 100

CONTENTS

Animal research.....	43	Feed grains.....	30	Poverty.....	5
Appropriations.....	1,54	Flood control.....	8	Recreation.....	3
Atomic energy.....	2	Food.....	26	Research.....	18,43,51
Attorney's fee.....	16	Food additives.....	47	Rural America.....	19,32
Budget.....	1,31	Food stamps.....	39	Supplemental	
Buildings.....	7	Foreign trade.....	15,44,49	appropriations.....	1
Chemical warfare.....	28	Green Thumb.....	9	Taxation.....	22,37,50
Cigarettes.....	20	Holiday.....	34	Textile imports.....	24
Claims.....	16	Information.....	14	Tobacco.....	20,52
Congress.....	31	Interest rates.....	10,22	Trails.....	13
Contracts.....	41	Labor.....	35	Transportation.....	16,42
Crop insurance.....	46	Meat imports.....	44	Veterans' benefits.....	38
Education.....	1,12,33	Mink imports.....	49	Water resources.....	6
Employees.....	1	Patents.....	4,27,53	Watersheds.....	8
Employment.....	48	Pesticides.....	11	Weather.....	51
Environment.....	18,40	Pollution.....	23,36	Wilderness.....	45
Export control.....	15	Population.....	26	Urban policy.....	29
Expositions.....	14	Postal service.....	25	Youth corps.....	17

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittee approved class I dairy bill. Senate committee reported Sawtooth National Recreation Area bill. Senate continued debate on second supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee voted to report bill to establish youth conservation program in USDA and Interior. Senate committee voted to report environmental quality policy bill. House passed cigarette smoking and advertising bill. Sen. Javits, et al, and Rep. Rogers, Fla., et al, introduced and discussed animal research facilities bills.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Continued debate on H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill. pp. S6686, S6691-722, S6729-31

Agreed to the following amendments:

By Sen. Yarborough, 52 43, to exempt certain educational programs from statutory budget cuts. pp. S6695-6

By Sen. Muskie to provide that whenever action or inaction by Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations, the Budget Director shall report to the President and the Congress his estimate of the effect thereof and the limitation on outlays shall be correspondingly adjusted, and the Budget Director shall report periodically to the President and the Congress on the operation of this provision. pp. S6712-13

Committee amendment, 60-25, to repeal section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act (limitation on the number of civilian officers and employees in the executive branch). pp. S6718-21

Committee amendment, 80-9, amended, to Title IV, to establish, with certain exemptions a limitation on fiscal 1970 budget outlays. p. S. 6718

Sen. Spong announced his intention to submit an amendment which would assure the continuance of cooperative extension service in D. C. through the Federal City College. pp. S6730-1

2. ATOMIC ENERGY. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reported without amendment S. 2416, to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission (S. Rept. 91-244). p. S6626

3. RECREATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. 853, to establish the Sawtooth National Recreation Area, Idaho (S. Rept. 91-260). p. S6626

The "Daily Digest" states that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 621, to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Wisc., H.R. 11069, to authorize funds to satisfy judgment in connection with acquisition of lands for Padre Island National Seashore, Tex., and S. 912, to establish Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument in Colorado. p. D518

4. PATENTS. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 90, to authorize the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with other interested parties, to arrange to convene an international conference to negotiate a Patent Cooperation Treaty and further authorize the appropriation of \$175,000 for this purpose. pp. S6623-4

5. POVERTY. Both Houses received from GAO a report on the effectiveness and administration of the community action program administered for the Office of Economic Opportunity by the Pinal County Community Action Program, Inc., Coolidge, Ariz. pp. S6625, H5021

ward meaningful disarmament, we have entered into responsibilities with high resolve as brave and high-spirited people, as the legatees of this great Nation, conscious of our duty to our Nation and the world. So, it must be now, today. We cannot avoid meeting the great issues and grappling with them from day to day. We must determine now to meet them and fulfill our destiny. Perhaps Communist intransigence may foil our earnest efforts, if so we will at least be checkmating an upward spiral in the arms race. It is unforgivable for us as a nation to refuse to face this important and senseless complicated challenge.

Finally, Mr. President, I believe that a decision to proceed now with talks in Geneva—together with prompt ratification of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty now pending in the Senate—is a natural position urged by the majority of the citizens of this great Republic of ours. Such an approach will carry a message of this Nation for peace and will carry great weight with the Soviet Government as well as the nations of the world. These actions will relieve the dread of arms competition escalating, the greatest unsettlement of all of the peoples of the world.

If there is one thing I wish I could have answered in my prayers, it is that we may find some way to lessen this deadly curse of arms competition so that we may meet the unfulfilled needs of our people and the world from hunger, intellectual wants, rebuilding cities; ad infinitum. High above and beyond material benefits whatever they may be, are those values giving us peace and the blotting out of all internal and international suspicions and absolute justice. There is only one thing, in my opinion, that can do this—disarmament. I cannot believe that these lofty aims are impossible. I only know, that it is necessary and I, therefore, together with others, utter my prayer to the Almighty for its fulfillment.

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPTS FROM A SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, APRIL 3, 1969

We now stand at a critical moment—a rare opportunity to break the upward spiral of strategic weaponry which has dominated U.S.-Soviet relations since the dawn of the atomic age.

We have had reason to believe for many months that the Soviet leaders are willing to begin bilateral negotiations over the control of offensive and defensive strategic weapons. Only the tragic Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia kept these talks from beginning last fall.

I have no illusions about the difficult nature of these negotiations. When responsible leaders of great nations approach their vital security interests, they do so with great caution. I know our leaders will not agree to anything that endangers our national security. And I make the same assumption about the Soviet leaders.

But I also assume that the Soviet leaders would not lightly enter into these talks with us. If that assumption is wrong, of course, all bets are off.

But we must believe, until their actions demonstrate otherwise, that the Soviets understand the compelling reasons for ending the nuclear arms spiral—a process which is not only expensive and dangerous, but one which has become meaningless in terms of

securing for either side a decisive military advantage.

We must pray that the Soviet leaders see the futility and folly of pursuing further a course which cannot possibly add either to their security or to ours, but which will instead lead all mankind closer to the brink of nuclear disaster.

It is, therefore, vitally important that we understand the urgency of beginning these bilateral talks as rapidly as possible.

I do not agree that these negotiations should await progress in settling more general political problems. The imperative of our present circumstances—that of preventing the next round in the nuclear arms race before it is irreversibly launched—cannot await the solution of political disputes many years in the making, and that will be many years, if not generations, in solving.

It is especially important that prior to the negotiations we exercise great restraint in word and action on matters relating to strategic weapons.

It is primarily for this reason that I have opposed the decision to proceed with a modified deployment of the anti-ballistic missile system. I remain unconvinced that the security of our second-strike forces required such action at this time.

More than this, however, there remain severe questions about the efficacy of the Safeguard system in comparison to other steps which might be taken to protect our ICBMs or to strengthen our Polaris fleet—steps which would avoid moving to the next level of nuclear weapons technology.

My concern for restraint in word and action prior to U.S.-Soviet negotiations also causes me to regret very much those statements imputing to the Soviets a commitment to achieve a first-strike capability in strategic nuclear weapons.

In a world where our Polaris fleet is constantly on station, in a world where we have proceeded very far in the development of multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles, I do not believe the Soviets could seriously delude themselves into thinking a first-strike capability was possible.

These statements, moreover, necessarily arise from a series of assumptions of long-term Soviet behavior, assumptions which by their nature can be neither proven nor disproven at this time and which remain, to say the least, a matter of considerable debate among our intelligence community.

Secretary Clark Clifford, for example, reached quite different conclusions as to the Soviet strategic posture less than three months ago. And Secretary of State Rogers clearly raised doubts about the reliability of these forecasts of a Soviet first-strike capability when he stressed the negotiability of the Safeguard system in any future arms control talks.

These forecasts of Soviet strategic intent—statements which depart markedly from earlier U.S. pronouncements—can only raise doubts in the Soviet mind about our strategic objectives. And we know from the past that doubt or uncertainty on either side about the strategic goals of the other has been a principal stimulus to the nuclear arms spiral.

A far more prudent course, in my opinion, would be one which avoided raising spectres of massive Soviet strategic commitments until we have determined through direct talks their actual willingness or unwillingness to decelerate the arms race. Then we will not have to speculate on such critical matters. We will know.

I trust we are wise enough to understand that within the Soviet government, as within our own, are found widely varying opinions and beliefs on the issue of strategic weapons. We must, it seems to me, be exceedingly careful not to erode through ill-considered statements or decisions the influence of those Soviet leaders who may be ad-

vocating a more rational policy of controlling the strategic arms race—those men who now seem to favor bilateral talks with the United States. For we can never doubt the Soviet Union's capacity to propel the arms race to new and more dangerous heights if saner and more rational heads do not prevail—just as the Soviets cannot doubt our ability to do likewise.

That is why our efforts must be directed toward beginning the negotiations as promptly as possible and in an atmosphere as conducive as possible to meaningful progress.

Let me also observe at this juncture: I would hope that our government would enter into these bilateral talks with a truly comprehensive proposal, one that raised all major issues for negotiation and which did not unilaterally restrict the flexibility and freedom of our negotiators.

Some people cannot conceive of the possibility that the two nuclear giants could ever reach an enforceable agreement to halt the arms race. These people may be right.

But even great powers with different values and different political and social systems share at least some areas of common interest. Manifestly the first area is a shared interest in survival.

Perhaps this does not respond to the highest ambitions of our hearts and minds. Perhaps it is no great compliment to the human race that it took nuclear weapons to teach us that lesson. But survival is an excellent place to start. It establishes the fact that the great powers today stand, in the most fundamental sense, on common ground. And from this, much that is sane and good can flow.

No doubt bilateral arms control talks with the Soviet Union will be difficult. No doubt they will take some time. More likely than not, they will have their ups and downs. But given the terrible risks to which the U.S., the Soviet Union and much of the world's populations will be exposed if the arms race proceeds unimpeded, we have the obligation—in the most profound sense of the word—to try.

Whatever we do has an element of risk—Isn't it time to take some risk for peace?

In all of this there is expectation—possibly premature but pregnant with hope for a world where the cold war is but a memory—where arms races are behind us—where peaceful engagement and reconciliation are the order of the day, East and West.

I think I know as well as any man just how hard it will be to get from here to there.

I know how many powerful traditions must be confined to history's junkyard—and how much new history must be made.

I know, too, that with all the will and all the energy we can summon, with the clearest vision and the most creative imagination, we cannot reform relations which others do not want to reform, or which they fear to reform.

But let history record that America was not the country which denied the people of this planet a chance for survival.

Let this nation boldly take the lead in working for arms control and disarmament—nuclear and conventional, global and regional—for peaceful settlement of those disputes which do arise among nations—for an atmosphere in which governments can at last devote maximum energies and resources to the needs and aspirations of their own peoples.

Let future generations read and know, that in a period of danger, uncertainty and peril—we had the extra measure of courage and character which challenged us to try.

This is the opportunity which now awaits us. I pray that we do not let it slip away. I pray that we are willing to take the risks for peace which can gradually transform the fragile balance of terror into a covenant of trust among nations.

For only as we succeed in replacing terror with trust, fear with faith, and suspicion with confidence can we expect to fashion the foundations of world order that are necessary for survival in the nuclear age.

MR. RICHARD P. CRANE, SR., RETIRES FROM WATERBURY CITY PLAN COMMISSION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, after 25 years of dedicated service, Mr. Richard P. Crane is retiring from the City Plan Commission of Waterbury, Conn.

Mr. Crane served as chairman of the commission for 19 years and as a member for the 6 preceding years. This was a quarter century of great change for communities all across the Nation, and Dick Crane was the person most responsible for keeping Waterbury in the mainstream of progressive civic activity.

He represents the best of the group of people in this country who give so generously of their time and of themselves to help their communities. In addition to his arduous and time-consuming work on the commission and his own business, Mr. Crane has quietly served in many other civic endeavors. I know of no one who better exemplifies the truth of the statement, "If you want a job done, give it to a busy man," than Richard P. Crane.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in a Connecticut newspaper commending Dick Crane for his 25 years of service to the city of Waterbury.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterbury American, June 13, 1969]

CRANE'S RETIREMENT

Many physical changes have taken place in Waterbury during the quarter-century that Richard P. Crane has served on the City Plan Commission. Some have been favorable, while others have pointed up the city's need for new rules for orderly future development. During the 19 years that he served as chairman and the six prior years as a member of the commission, Crane has sincerely worked for betterment of the city. It has been a time-consuming task, and the many controversies involved because of the nature of the commission's work made it even more difficult.

Crane is retiring from the commission at a time when the city is in the process of acquiring the long-awaited comprehensive plan of development, and he can leave with a feeling of ease because this most important project of the commission is now being fulfilled. New commercial development in the downtown and outlying areas, the new highway system, and heavy residential developments have changed the city so extensively that new rules for traffic patterns, development and zoning are needed. The city needs to know now, more than ever before, exactly what type of development is desirable and feasible in each specific area.

One of Crane's greatest accomplishments for the city came through his leadership in efforts to get a regional airport to serve Waterbury. Although this was not a City Plan Commission project, the development of the airport can be linked directly to future progress in city development. Through the Chamber of Commerce and through his leadership in the industrial and business community, Crane fought for some 20 years for state and federal funds for construction

of the airport. These efforts required an immeasurable amount of time for writing letters, making official contacts and organizing campaigns. Now the regional airport is under construction in Oxford. It will serve ultimately as a new economic stimulus for Waterbury and the surrounding area.

In seeking a successor to Crane, Mayor George Harlamon should keep in mind the important role that City Plan Commission can play in determining the city's future. He should pick a leader who has a deep interest in development and planning, who is knowledgeable about the community and who has had experience which could be helpful to the commission. This should not be a political appointment, nor should popularity determine the selection. Ability, dedication, and a deep interest in betterment of the city are the basic requirements.

Crane gave long and dedicated service to the city. His record of service on the commission will in all likelihood never be equaled again. He deserves thanks from the city for his devotion to this assignment.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Subsequently, the Senate modified this order to provide for the Senate to adjourn until 11 a.m. tomorrow.)

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JUNE 19, UNTIL 11 A.M., FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow, it stand in adjournment until 11 a.m., Friday, June 20, 1969.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HUGHES ON FRIDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday, after the conclusion of the prayer and the disposition of the Journal of the preceding day, the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) be recognized for not to exceed 40 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to retain the floor, but with that proviso, I should like to yield to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) for not to exceed 5 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. I appreciate the courtesy of the majority leader.

S. 2433—INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL GUN CERTIFICATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I take the floor today to continue a fight I first started 8 years ago. In early 1961 I directed the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency to study the increasing use of firearms in America's booming crime wave. We found that thousands of deadly weapons were finding their way into the hands of America's felons, rapists, and drug addicts by mail order and by over-the-counter sales to out-of-State residents.

I introduced my first gun bill in August of 1963 and in the intervening years I implored the Congress to stop the madness that characterized the gun traffic across our State lines. Those of us on the committee who fought for interstate firearms controls had few friends during the long years between 1963 and 1968. We had held hearings and worked on the legislative solution to this problem for 7 years.

But the country was not ready for it. Then we witnessed a series of political assassinations that shocked the Nation and the Congress.

Then we slowly began to get support for the kind of gun laws we needed.

I am grateful for the support that was received, but unfortunately it was not soon enough and it did not contribute enough.

But we did ultimately pass a good gun bill that was long overdue. The Gun Control Act of 1968 marked the first time in America's history that effective controls were put on the interstate traffic in firearms. We had successfully frozen the 200 million guns that exist in America today within the boundaries of the various States.

But we needed more. I had introduced a second bill that would have complemented the Gun Control Act of 1968 which would have enabled us to find out who owned the existing millions of guns.

But the support of the Johnny-come-latelys faded fast and my second bill

From August, 1968, through March, 1969, there were 9 murders committed, 5 of which were committed with handguns.

This represents a decrease in the total number of murders committed from August, 1968, through March, 1969, of 55% and for the same period the murders committed by handguns decreased 58.34%.

ROBBERIES

From December, 1967, through July, 1968, there were 778 robberies, 222 of which were committed with handguns.

From August, 1968, through March, 1969, there were 537 robberies committed, 127 of which were committed with handguns.

This represents a decrease in the total number of robberies committed from August, 1968, through March, 1969, of 30.98% and for the same period the robberies committed by handguns decreased 42.79%.

AGGRAVATED ASSAULTS

From December, 1967, through July, 1968, there were 293 aggravated assaults committed, 109 of which involved the use of handguns.

From August, 1968, through March, 1969, there were 242 aggravated assaults committed, 55 of which involved handguns.

This represents a decrease in the total number of aggravated assaults committed from August, 1968, through March, 1969, of 17.41% and for the same period the aggravated assaults committed involving handguns decreased 49.09%.

CARRYING CONCEALED WEAPONS

From December, 1967, through July, 1968, there were 101 offenses of carrying concealed weapons committed, 79 of which involved handguns.

From August, 1968, through July, 1969, there were 90 offenses of carrying concealed weapons committed, 57 of which involved handguns.

This represents a decrease in the total number of carrying concealed weapons offenses committed from August, 1968, through March, 1969, of 10.90% and for the same period the carrying concealed weapons offenses involving handguns decreased 27.85%.

I think you will agree with me that these figures are startling in view of the rising crime rate throughout our country. While we make no claim that Toledo's decreasing crime rate is the sole result of the handgun ordinance, we nevertheless feel that the passage of that ordinance has played a most important part in the success we have had in our town in fighting crime in the streets.

Other factors are involved. We have increased the size of our police force. We have had full cooperation with the courts in the prosecution of offenders, and we have had a vigorous crime enforcement program going on by our police department for some time.

The City of Toledo has issued approximately 15,000 plus identification cards to applicants under the handgun ordinance. There have been only 40 rejections of applications, mainly on the basis of histories of mental illness. The balance were rejected for criminal records, which made the applicant ineligible.

There have been 48 prosecutions of violations of the handgun ordinance and 48 convictions. The average penalty assessed is \$150.00 plus 90 days in jail.

The newspapers, and television and radio stations have been extremely cooperative and enthusiastic in their support of the Toledo ordinance. They have given full publicity to the statistics and details of convictions and results of trials. I think that this has played a major role in Toledo's success. The word has gone out that if you are caught with a gun on the streets of Toledo you are going to go to jail.

At the present time there are several bills pending in the General Assembly of the State of Ohio and hearings have commenced on

them wherein a similar law is being proposed for the state of Ohio. We just recently testified in behalf of such a bill and we are running into the usual opposition of the National Rifle Association, which is very strong in our state. Anything you or your committee can do to help us pass an effective statute in Ohio will be more than appreciated.

The particular bill in question is House Bill #184 and is now pending in the House Judiciary Committee. I am enclosing a copy of the bill for your information. There are several things in the bill which we think need to be strengthened or clarified but the bill has had only its first hearing and if it is voted out of committee, it will undoubtedly be greatly modified and changed to where you won't recognize the original bill.

If you have any thoughts on the matter, we would appreciate it if you would convey them to us so that we can pass this information along to the Judiciary Committee with whom we have a good working relationship.

If there is anything you need or want from us, please don't hesitate to call upon us. We would like to have you come to Toledo to see for yourself our operation under Toledo's handgun ordinance. We have established an office called the "Office of Gun Control" with a full time staff for the processing of applications. The Police Department has maintained good records and does as much as it can to investigate the applicants before applications are approved.

Our only problem is that our jurisdiction ends at the city limits and the gun dealers outside the city over whom we have no control are doing a landoffice business. This is where the need for statewide control legislation is so apparent to us, but it is not so apparent to some members of the House Judiciary Committee.

Please feel free to call us at any time.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. BURKHART,
Chief Counsel.

TOLEDO POLICE DIVISION

	Monthly report				Year to date				March 1969 total	
	March 1969		March 1968		1969		1968		1968	
	Offenses	Clearances	Offenses	Clearances	Offenses	Clearances	Offenses	Clearances	Offenses	Clearances
Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter		100.0	4	100.0	3	100.0	10	70.0	22	72.7
Negligent manslaughter, auto	2	50.0			6	50.0	3	166.6	16	106.3
Rape, force only	5	80.0	11	63.6	17	47.1	29	75.9	86	77.9
Robbery	49	20.4	103	32.0	164	23.8	302	34.4	1,027	28.1
Aggravated assault	26	92.3	24	70.8	78	89.7	107	80.4	419	84.5
Burglary, breaking and/or entering	267	29.2	376	23.4	741	24.3	1,002	27.4	3,631	30.4
Larceny, \$50 and over value	268	17.2	196	14.8	812	14.7	529	14.0	2,763	14.0
Larceny, under \$50 value	558	25.4	608	33.1	1,474	26.3	1,587	29.0	8,369	25.0
Auto theft	118	61.0	106	22.6	377	39.8	359	21.7	1,424	35.0
Total, class No. 1 offenses and attempts	1,283	29.2	1,428	28.2	3,672	26.1	3,928	28.3	17,757	27.2

	Number
Safety director	3
Chief's office	10
City manager's office	1
Deputy chief, detectives	3
Deputy chief, police	1
Captain, academy	3
Deputy chief, identification and records	3
Deputy chief, traffic	3
No. 1 station	1
Crime prevention bureau	3
Dispatchers office	2
City journal office	1
Prosecutors office	2
Toledo Blade	1
Civil service commission	1
Toledo Municipal League	1

	Number	Percent
Serious offenses reported:		
March 1969	723	
March 1968	820	
Down	97	-11.8
3 months, 1969	2,192	
3 months, 1968	2,338	
Down	146	-6.2

	Number	Percent
Total offenses reported:		
March 1969	1,283	
March 1968	1,428	
Down	145	-10.2
3 months, 1969	3,672	
3 months, 1968	3,928	
Down	256	-6.5
Clearances:		
March 1969	29.2	
March 1968	28.2	
Up		+1.0
3 months, 1969	26.1	
3 months, 1968	28.3	
Down		-2.2
High police districts:		
Unit 11	102	
Unit 12	96	
Unit 9	87	

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supple-

mental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning on page 70, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

On page 70, after line 3, strike out:

"Sec. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000; *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending,

and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

"(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$187,900,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount shall be increased or decreased by the aggregate amount by which the sum of expenditures and net lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser than the sum of expenditures and net lending in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for—

"(1) items designated 'Open-ended programs and fixed costs' in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-first Congress);

"(2) the item designated 'Special South-east Asia support' in the table appearing on page 27 of that budget; and

"(3) programs of aid to schools in federally impacted areas, under the Acts of September 23 and September 30, 1950 (20 U.S.C., chs. 13 and 19).

"(b) The President shall reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations or other obligatory authority heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available (including amounts made available to carry out programs to which title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments is applicable), such amounts as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of subsection (a).

"Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1,900,000,000 in expenditures and net lending, below the amounts recommended in the April review of the 1970 Budget, or programs other than those designated in subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

"(c) In the administration of any program as to which—

"(1) the amount of expenditures or net lending is limited pursuant to subsection (a), and

"(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution, the amount available for expenditure or obligation (as determined by the President) shall be substituted, in the application of the formula, for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 2440—INTRODUCTION OF THE VETERANS HOUSING ACT OF 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the expanded veterans direct home loan program under section 1811 of title 38 of the United States Code.

I think that the whole problem of how to deal with returning veterans is now coming into focus again, with the announced withdrawal of 25,000 American troops from Vietnam, and further withdrawals which seem to me to be clearly indicated. Even without that reduction in Vietnam troops, over 1 million GI's will be returning to civilian life this year at the rate of approximately 90,000 a month and, therefore, we must take a close look at what is happening to them.

I am glad to see that the occupant of the chair at the present moment is the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) who is now conducting a series of hearings on a very important phase of this particular matter of veterans' rehabilitation.

There are three measures in which I have joined, one of which I am introducing today and the others I have introduced before.

The one today would increase the availability of GI home loans by expanding the authority of the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans. There has been at least a 50-percent falloff because of high interest rates and the unavailability of credit in the amount of veterans' loans which have been made this year.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we must do our utmost to correct that situation.

Also, I have introduced a Veterans' Administration Relocation Assistance Act of 1969 to help veterans find jobs, which I cosponsored with the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH). Also an increase in the education benefits available to returning veterans, which is in a series of bills now being considered under the chairmanship of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON).

I wish to point out the essentiality of seeing all of these three matters, so far as veterans are concerned; jobs, housing, and education. The veteran is entitled to the social and economic benefits which he has been denied by virtue of withdrawing from ongoing activities and giving his life as well as his time to the Armed Forces of the United States.

We should get back, in return, greater national stability, if we do the right thing by our returning veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2440), to amend and expand the veterans' direct home loan program under section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2446—INTRODUCTION OF THE HUMANE LABORATORY ANIMAL TREATMENT ACT OF 1969

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and Senators BROOKE, COOPER, COTTON, GURNEY, KENNEDY and MCINTYRE, the Humane Laboratory Animal Treatment Act of 1969. It is the purpose of this bill to provide for the humane care, handling and treatment of laboratory animals and to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling and treatment, and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort, of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities.

A companion measure is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representative PAUL ROGERS of Florida and more than 20 Members of that body. I joined with Representative ROGERS in sponsoring a similar proposal in the 90th Congress. This bill was prepared in collaboration with the Humane Society of the United States, the American Humane Society and the New York State Society for Medical Research, and has their active support.

I supported the present animal protection legislation, Public Law 89-544, when it was originally enacted and have subsequently supported needed funding for its efficient administration. We all expected that the system of care would have to be completed to do what all wished done—for the present regulations only take care of the animal to the threshold of the research laboratory but not beyond.

The goal of this measure is to complete the structure of law for the protection of laboratory animals.

Although this measure is similar to the bill that I introduced in the 90th Congress, in response to the opinion of many interested Americans there is a basic modification. The bill I now introduce has been revised so that it does not transfer responsibility for the administration of any part of Public Law 89-544—the Laboratory Welfare Act of 1966—from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I wish to emphasize that the animal dealer and laboratory regulations provided under Public Law 89-544 are neither repealed nor absorbed into the extended program provided for by this bill—which now takes the care of the animal beyond the threshold of the research laboratory—and the Department of Agriculture will continue the work it has initiated. Also, it should be noted that although Public Law 89-544 protects only six species—dogs, cats, monkeys, guinea pigs, hamsters and rabbits—the bill I am introducing would protect any living warm-blooded vertebrate animal which is used or intended for use in connection with biomedical activities. Other revisions in this legislation clarify various portions of the bill, to strengthen it and avoid some past misunderstandings.

I might add that I was further impelled to introduce this legislation by

the encouragement given me in 1966 during the debate on the animal protection legislation then before the Senate—now Public Law 89-544—when Senator WARREN MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and floor leader of the debate, stated with respect to a measure then pending very similar to the Rogers-Javits bill which I introduced in 1966, that he was "very hopeful that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will report the Senator's bill."

Senator MAGNUSON further indicated—

That bill would add to the whole objective. We could then really do something about this very serious problem of animal welfare which we have in the United States.

This legislation represents an earnest effort by humanitarians and the scientific community to reach a realistic understanding of the purpose animals should play in biomedical research and a basic appreciation of the valuable role these animals serve on behalf of mankind.

Medical research involving the use of laboratory animals has contributed to bringing about a significant reduction in human suffering and mortality rates, but also this research can and must be conducted under proper and humane conditions for the animals concerned—both are compatible and feasible. A mark of our civilization is how we treat those creatures who cannot speak for themselves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and as a part of the same unanimous-consent request, I ask unanimous consent that, should the Committee on Commerce wish to review the bill after the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare shall have reported it out, then the Committee on Commerce may have that right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and without objection, referred as requested.

The bill (S. 2446), to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish further standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods of minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (by unanimous consent); and, if and when reported, to the Committee on Commerce, if so desired.

ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this is the third day on which the Senate has given consideration to the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1969. There has been one rollcall vote thus far, on one amendment. There are at least four amendments, of which I am aware, yet to be offered, and there may be more. Following the disposition by the Senate of this bill, of course, we still must go to conference with the House.

I say this to premise a statement which I am now going to make to the effect that while I do not want to be arbitrary with any Member of the Senate, I think I shall feel constrained to object to any request to speak out of order under rule VIII today.

Mr. President, the staff on both sides of the aisle may wish to alert Senators to that fact, so that they will not come to the floor expecting to make a 10- or 15- or 20-minute speech out of order but will be informed that an objection will be made if a unanimous-consent request to waive rule VIII is submitted.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceed to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am willing to delay the discussion of the Yarborough amendment yet a little while. But I am also ready to have a vote on that amendment, up or down, and I am not too concerned which way the Senate goes. I happen to be the Senator who is trying to manage the bill, and I shall support the committee position on the amendment, but I am ready for a vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I simply want to say, that if Senators opposed to the committee amendment wish to speak, somebody had better show up pretty soon, else I am going to call off the quorum and let the Chair put the question. Time is wasting and there is much work to be done.

Now, does the Senator from Alabama wish me to yield to him for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not for a question.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. For a unanimous-consent request only?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and I would like to make some very brief remarks.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Just a moment. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a unanimous-consent request only.

ates, Inc., of Wilmington, Del., and past president of the National Association of Home Builders, presented a very fine speech to the 38th annual convention of the National Housing Conference.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS—THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR STAKE

(Address by Leon N. Weiner, president of Leon N. Weiner & Associates, Inc.)

The 1968 Housing Act spelled out our national housing goals. In addition to quantification of the low and moderate income units needed in the next decade, it focused attention on the total housing requirements of our nation.

It further spelled out, in rather great detail, a procedure for making the production of the housing a "living goal." I seriously commend a careful reading of Title XVI of this Act, because Title XVI requires a "plan."

This "plan," according to the Act, shall spell out the "number" of new or rehabilitated units which need to be provided, with or without government assistance, during each year of the ten year period. Further, it is to show the number of such units to be provided under each of the various Federal programs designed to assist in the provision of housing.

The "plan" shall also indicate the reduction in the number of substandard housing units during the ten years and each year thereof; shall provide estimates of the cost of carrying out the various Federal programs; make recommendations with regard to the legislative and administrative actions needed or desirable to achieve the objectives of the plan. The plan shall contain a projection of the residential mortgage market needs and prospects during the coming year—including a fairly detailed report, together with such recommendations for making these funds available.

But, in addition to a plan, the 1968 Housing Act calls for a process of check-up and periodic annual reports. The Act spells out that the reports shall include comparison of the results achieved, together with the objectives set forth for the same periods; an analysis of the failure to reach the objectives if, indeed, they were not achieved during that year—indicating the reason for the failure, the steps being taken to realize the results during the remaining years, and any necessary revisions.

The Act calls for detailed reports with regard to residential mortgage market needs, flow of mortgage funds, analysis of monetary and fiscal policies required to implement the "plan" and its impact upon the domestic economy (including, I am sure, the effects of inflation!), as well as making the necessary recommendations toward achieving the total ten year program.

The big question, of course, is: "Are these national housing goals achievable?" Can this nation provide twenty-six million housing units in the next decade? Can we provide the six million units for low and moderate income families, as well as the twenty million others called for in the 1968 Housing Act and in the plan? The answer, in my opinion, is a resounding "Yes!"

There are many who doubt our ability as a nation to accomplish the goals. . . . and there are all too few who have carefully analyzed, digested, and applied their thinking toward making these goals alive and dynamic. There are few who question the need. There are, however, many who doubt—many who think the goals are too high or unrealistic, or who find themselves overwhelmed by the obstacles and impediments.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year

NATIONAL HOUSING GOALS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on March 10, 1969, Mr. Leon N. Weiner, president of Leon N. Weiner & Associ-

CAN INDUSTRY PRODUCE THE REQUIRED HOUSING?

Let us examine these questions: Can the present industry, structured the way it is, meet the task of doubling the production of housing units? Isn't the present industry inefficient, fragmented, archaic, and obsolete in its organization and technology? Wouldn't this nation be better off having government actually undertake the total program? Shouldn't we concentrate on development of huge new government or quasi-government agencies which will overcome the obstacles and accomplish major new breakthroughs such as have been achieved in the aerospace industry? Why don't we manufacture houses the way we do so many other consumer goods—by developing national markets and mass producing all the housing at greatly reduced costs?

Recently, numerous studies and proposals have been advanced on many of these questions—including the Douglas Commission Report, the Kaiser Committee Report, and many HUD experiments and some demonstration programs, some of which are still in process.

What are some of the facts? Are there any clear and simple answers? The present housing industry has demonstrated its ability to produce and meet the housing markets of this country. Since World War II, the housing inventory of this nation has been doubled. More than thirty-five million units have been added to the supply. There has been a constant introduction of new materials and technology, and it is being absorbed as rapidly as the marketplace will accept it. Rather than being inefficient, numerous studies have indicated a fantastic level of efficiency and effectiveness in a highly competitive free market environment. There are really few people who honestly believe that this nation would be better off having the government actually undertake the total production of housing. The private sector can, has, and will continue to demonstrate its ability to produce more efficiently and effectively. This is not to negate the need for a real and working partnership between the private and public sectors.

The turnkey program, the Section 23 Leasing Program, and similar related programs have already demonstrated this in part. Modifications of and improvements of moderate income housing programs and third sector participation with non-profit sponsors can further increase production in this area. Congressional, as well as regulatory shackles, will have to be removed from many of these programs, but we have already seen some results in the HUD accelerated multi-family processing program. Hopefully, this trend will continue.

The problems of local market decisions, of the middle class aspirations of low and moderate income families, of growing policies directed against huge concentrations of "project" type housing enclaves, all make the solutions of mass "factory" produced housing complex and unacceptable. Local market design decisions—including community desires as well as the aspirations of low and moderate income families, are very strong indeed. We cannot ignore these factors. Changes will be relatively slow and gradual. While many new and innovative experiments in this direction will be undertaken, and some may prove successful, the history of this course of action as an overall solution suggests it is a long way off. The recent Battelle Institute study for the AFL-CIO Building Trades' Department contains an analysis of many of the problems down that path. This important study describes, in great detail—both the trends and techniques in the construction of housing as it is practiced. To ignore these studies and the practical applications in the field is simply the kind of wishful thinking which many of us have indulged in at some time during our careers in the housing industry.

The facts, however, simply will not be refuted.

We simply cannot look for new technology and techniques and dramatic breakthroughs to solve these problems immediately, but must face the realities of the present and skillfully and constructively use the tools and resources presently available.

The housing industry should be regarded as a national resource and so nurtured and developed so as to maximize its effectiveness in achieving our national goals. The industry itself is really quick to change to new types of organizations. It can and will arise to meet the needs, provided that the economic incentives are available and realizable. If we regard the present knowledge and skills, as well as organization of the housing industry in this fashion, we need not wait to see whether new forms, new structures, new conglomerates, new agencies are either workable or feasible. It is important to move forward on all fronts.

On Sunday, March 9, just yesterday, before the Third Annual Conference of Regional Councils in San Francisco, Mr. Samuel C. Jackson, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development of HUD, in his first major address since taking office, urged the Regional Councils to be less concerned with the technology of construction and more with the actions necessary to produce sites, community facilities, and services. Jackson told the Conference that "... your advice, counsel, and action is needed now to do away with discriminatory zoning practices, outmoded, or over-specialized building codes, and development standards that drive up the cost of housing."

What, then, are some of the major impediments to achieving our national goals, aside from the organization of the industry and its technology? These include, among others, land and sites, manpower, cost and supply of materials and, of course, the fundamental and crucial problem of adequate long-term capital credit and governmental subsidy. *It becomes very difficult to properly evaluate which impediment is most crucial*, but anyone in any housing program knows that land, suitably located with adequate facilities and at a reasonable price, is one of the most difficult to resolve. Zoning codes and their administration, as well as a fantastic lack of advance installation of roads and transportation, sewers, water supply, schools, and other fundamental facilities, have contributed to skyrocketing land costs.

THE NEED FOR LAND POLICIES

The development of a national urban growth policy, or a national urbanization policy, or an urban land policy has certainly been projected onto the front burner for serious and critical consideration.

Secretary of HUD, George Romney, on March 4, 1969, before the meeting of the National Association of Counties, spoke of the recognition of "a need for a national urban growth policy—one which will include consideration of internal migration, the concerns of small towns, the development of new towns, as well as the problems of the inner city."

There is no question about a basic need for the development of such policies—but a word of caution is also needed. Just as there will not be any magic or all encompassing breakthrough in construction technology which will produce miracles, neither can we expect answers from some of the magic "solutions," such as advocated by Marian Clawson, an official of Resources for the Future, Inc., who stated at the 2020 Conference in New York on January 31, "I am convinced that no really significant change can be made in the process of urban and suburban growth—unless there is a major program of public acquisition of land and a major intrusion of public agencies into the land conversion process."

An examination of current suburban land-use policies, based primarily upon negative

and exclusionary principles and administered by public agencies, is enough to raise the word of caution. Those of us who have had practical experience with the suburban "mind," a very powerful influence in the shaping of land use policies, well know that even a metropolitan approach will not resolve the critical question of how, when, and where publicly owned land shall be disposed. Add to this the critical problem of the relationship between such publicly acquired lands and any or all privately owned land, and it becomes even more difficult to resolve.

There are those who regard new communities as the ultimate answer. A recent report by a professional association task force stated their belief that, "New communities will offer new types of environments, free from the worst irritants and pressures of metropolitan areas, in which people will have a better chance to work toward ending the dangerous divisions between black and white, rich and poor, and young and old that are increasing in the United States today." What a beautiful world that would be! Our present patterns of growth have produced many problems and, hopefully, again, new communities may help to prevent such things as urban sprawl. We need to be concerned with urban sprawl. The causes have inter-relationship with our growth patterns. Equally, before significant and major contributions can be made with respect to new communities, we must resolve the economics not only in the feasibility of the new community itself but in the need for jobs and services without which no community can survive.

My deepest concern is that, in the search for new answers, we fail to heed the words of Assistant Secretary Jackson. ... that we forget the day-to-day fight for sites, community facilities, and services. If we are to achieve our national housing goals, our urban land policy needs to zero in on short range workable programs now, utilizing all the tools, techniques, and powers which can make the necessary land available today, tomorrow, and next year—while carefully examining and experimenting with innovations, testing them in practice, and carefully culling those which cannot or will not work in our American society from those that will produce results. Assistant Secretary Jackson certainly put his finger on the problem. Those of us involved in the day-to-day fight for sites realize that deep down and underlying many of the other problems is the issue of color. Mayor Walter Washington stated that, in his opinion, the name of the game was fair housing practices. Few communities are ready to be that frank. In one community, for example, the name of the game was "historical architectural compatibility," and the problem allegedly was how to get approval of the site for a high-rise building which did not have shutters or wrought iron ornamentation which happened to be characteristic of this community.

One of the significant steps forward in the day-to-day fight for sites is the requirement in the Housing Act of 1968 for a housing element in connection with the 701 grants. This needs to be further deepened and expanded. If we are to have national housing goals, we must have state housing goals, county housing goals, and municipal housing goals—each of which, in turn, constitutes the component sections of a national goal. Without these local goals, we cannot fully succeed.

MANPOWER AND MATERIALS TO MEET THE GOALS

Can we provide the manpower to double the production of housing units in our nation—in order to meet our national goals?

An effective manpower training program and the smashing of previous employment practices, together with the introduction of new component technology, will offer solutions toward that problem. The major impediment has been to convince many involved people that there are critical manpower shortages and that streamlined training pro-

grams and elimination of racial barriers are fundamental to overcoming this impediment. The training of additional manpower must be regarded as an opportunity for added employment and not as competition for the jobs of those already employed in the construction industry. The need is great for both the long term replacement of the mechanics in our industry whose average age has increased drastically in the last ten years, as well as for the vastly increased number of man hours of production which will be needed to satisfy the sharply increased expansion of housing supply.

No one, at this moment in our history, could speak about housing without referring to the inflationary and runaway price patterns of building materials and, most especially, lumber. The phenomenal rise of lumber prices in one short year has nearly doubled the cost of this essential building product. The causes are complex and confusing but, once again, the solutions lie in an examination of the problem with the production of our housing goals as an ultimate objective. If this involves major changes in other national policies, such as the supply of timber from our national forests which have more than half of the nation's resources, or an embargo on shipment of logs to Japan, or a strengthening of the small mill producers by extensive government loans in order to increase their ability to add to the supply, then the steps to achieve this must be consciously undertaken as part of the policies necessary to achieve our housing goals.

RESOLVING MORTGAGE CREDIT PROBLEMS

Finally, and without attempting to elaborate any additional and contributing impediments, the most crucial matter of mortgage credit and funding of the housing programs becomes the major stumbling block to meeting our national housing goals.

First, with respect to appropriation. . . . If the Congress believes in the housing goals it has established—and particularly in the programs which require subsidy—it cannot restrict and squeeze the life out of the funding for the programs it has approved.

There was certainly strong bi-partisan support for the 1968 Housing Act. One could argue that the "rent supplement" program never received proper funding because of its narrow margin of victory in the Congress, but, surely, the Section No. 235—Homeownership Program, and Section No. 236—Moderate Rental Programs did not have that history. A word about the subsidies for programs such as Section No. 235—Homeownership and the Section No. 236—Moderate Rental Programs. We believe that this type of subsidy program is constructively oriented to the consumer. Our industry has not looked for subsidy for itself. Too often, people have considered programs such as the FHA Middle Income Housing Program as a direct subsidy. True, it involved federal intervention in the financing process, but no home builder nor homeowner received public funds and, even the cost of administering the FHA program, has been minimal. As a matter of fact, a careful examination of the history of FHA will show that it has not been an expense in the government program but actually returned funds to the Treasury.

Secondly, despite much discussion and many motions toward providing housing with the necessary shelter and incentives—toward attracting long and even short term capital to the industry to give it a competitive position in the capital markets of our nation, we are today, once again, on the verge of a major crisis in both cost of and supply of mortgage credit. Pension funds, one of the major sources of long term credit, continue to plow billions into speculative stock market issues—bypassing the fixed interest rate return of mortgages. The Federal Reserve Board openly admits to its failure to provide protection to the relatively weak competitive position of residential mortgages.

In 1966, when the tight money crunch vir-

tually ground housing production down to a level equivalent to less than forty percent of the 2.6 million units needed to achieve our housing goals, many long hours were spent in looking for solutions. Too few proposals have been put into effect and too few people today understand that our housing goals will not be achieved unless the mortgage credit problems are resolved.

LOW AND MODERATE IN RELATION TO ALL HOUSING

There are many in this nation who feel deeply concerned about housing the low and moderate income families. There are an increasing number who understand the sense of urgency and need to move effectively and vigorously to accomplish this part of our national goals. Those of us who have had any contact with the urban core problems in cities and towns are especially conscious and place strong emphasis on the low and moderate income family needs in housing.

There is, however, a great danger of divisiveness and polarization in our nation if we fail to provide housing opportunity to our other citizens as well. The Kerner Report, with all of its insight, understood and underscored this danger. While emphasizing the low and moderate income programs, let us not fall into the trap of blindly setting other housing requirements as the opposition.

If funds need to be allocated, let them come from the Apollo program or from other sources, rather than from other housing programs. If we are to continue to support tax shelter through depreciation and other incentives to produce low and moderate housing, we must not make the mistake of excluding other housing needs. I cannot too strongly urge our most serious consideration of this course of action.

COMMITMENT AND ACTION FOR ATTAINMENT

What is needed is a sense of commitment. What is needed is the development of conscious policies of priorities. What is needed is a program of action to really make the housing goals into "living goals."

There is no question that, without this sense of commitment, the national housing goals become, once again, simply a statement of the desirable which, like so many other good things, would be shelved till later. We cannot and will not achieve our housing goals unless and until we apply ourselves—the private sector, the public sector, and the people's sector to implementation of the "plan." In a recent speech, Charles B. Reeder, Senior Associate Economist of the Dupont Company, raised the question whether we will achieve twenty-six million additional dwellings by 1978. His answer was that it would be something less. He said, "What won't be produced in the 1970's is most of the six million subsidized units called for by the Housing Act of 1968. The reasons these won't be produced are (a) the goal is unrealistic to begin with, and (b) the incentives offered are totally inadequate to get a task of this magnitude done. The goal of six million subsidized units is not supported by basic economic analysis. It represents the number of housing units that Washington would like to see produced in order to give every poor American a decent home—a worthwhile aim, but hardly the basis for a forecast." This is a challenge. While this may be but one man's opinion of the problems facing our nation in meeting its housing goals, it certainly indicates the magnitude and nature of the problem.

In his Letter of Transmittal dated January 17, 1969, in which he sent the first annual report on national housing goals to the Congress of the United States, President Johnson says, ". . . The housing goals of the 1968 Act are firm national commitments. I urge the Congress, State, and local officials, and concerned individuals to give careful consideration to this report."

If the "plan" needs to be revised, let it be done consciously and deliberately and

not by default. Those of us in this nation concerned with housing must keep the housing goals as "living goals."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The Chair is advised by the parliamentarian that under the previous order the Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island is ready to present the case for the amendment of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH); therefore, I relinquish my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy. I am sorry that Senator YARBOROUGH is not available to call up his amendment, however, I am delighted to act in his stead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 44.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 44

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 44 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) on behalf of himself and other Senators, proposes an amendment, as follows:

The proposed section 401 of the bill is amended (1) by striking out in lines 19 through 22, page 71, "(including amounts made available to carry out programs to which title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments is applicable)", (2) by striking "and" in line 13, page 71, (3) by striking out the period at the end of line 16, page 71, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and", (4) by inserting after line 16, page 71, the following new paragraph:

"(4) the programs to which title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 (Public Law 90-247) is applicable."

and (5) by striking out "and (3)" on lines 3 and 4, page 72, and inserting in lieu thereof "(3) and (4)".

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, amendment No. 44 contains the exemption of educational programs from statutory budget cuts.

To give this action some historical perspective it should be noted that section 406 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 exempts all educational programs in the Office of Education from statutory budget ceilings.

Last year the Senate was called upon to recommit the bill which created this exemption for educational programs, with instructions to delete that specific exemption. This move was defeated by a record vote of 58 to 11.

The amendment we are considering today would reaffirm the action previously taken by the Senate to permit the Congress to decide the level of spending for education.

The supplemental appropriations bill as reported exempts uncontrollable expenditures from the budget ceiling which would be imposed and directs the President to reserve from appropriations such amounts as may be necessary to keep expenditures below that ceiling; thereby requiring the reductions to be taken from controllable expenditures. The amendment transfers education appropriations from the controllable category to the uncontrollable category.

On a more general point, I think that enactment of section 401 as written may constitute an abdication of legislative responsibility on the part of the Senate. The legislation as passed by the House reserved to the Congress the right to appropriate such sums as it deemed to be necessary for particular programs. The final responsibility for how much was to be spent in any program was reserved to the Congress. The language of the committee amendment to the House bill turns full responsibility for determination of the amount to be spent on any program over to the Bureau of the Budget and the White House.

If the committee language is enacted, we may find ourselves in the position of appropriating certain sums for a specific program. However, that appropriation would have no effect whatsoever unless the Budget Bureau decided to take notice of the congressional intent. Does not appropriating money with one hand and then permitting the Bureau of the Budget to withhold expenditures on the other hand constitutes an act of bad faith; for example in the field of education we promised the American people that we will spend funds for library resources and textbooks, but at the same time we allow the Bureau of the Budget to withhold those funds and decide on its own priorities.

The Congress of the United States is given primary legislative authority by the Constitution. The power of the President under the Constitution with respect to legislation is simply to approve or disapprove acts of Congress. By enacting legislation giving the President the authority to make a second review of our legislation we are abdicating authority the Constitution vested in the Congress. Indeed, we are supplementing

the Constitution by giving the President an additional veto power over acts of Congress.

The Constitution gives the President only one veto. When we enact legislation permitting the President to reserve funds from our appropriations we are giving him a second chance to approve or disapprove our legislation.

What this amounts to is the item veto. And the Constitution does not permit the item veto on legislation. The President must approve or disapprove an entire act of Congress. He may not pick and choose among parts of a bill that is enacted. When we permit the President to pick and choose from among our appropriations we are in effect giving him item veto authority.

Senators who are concerned with the power of the Presidency should be fearful of granting the President such extraordinary power as the item veto.

In a more parochial vein I speak now as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education and point out a further reason for opposition to section 401(b). Last year the Congress enacted a provision of law which reserves to itself the authority to decide how much Federal money was to be spent on education. Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 was amended to provide that all appropriations for education programs would remain available for obligation until the end of the fiscal year for which they were appropriated.

That amendment removed from the executive branch any statutory authority to impound or freeze education funds. That act was not intended to place education above all other areas of Government concern, but since the pending legislation dealt only with education legislation, the provision dealt only with education. With the enactment of that legislation Congress stated, as policy, that the President should not have statutory authority to impound or freeze funds appropriated by Congress. If education funds are to be cut, then the Congress ought to do it in the proper appropriation acts, and, I might add, take responsibility for those cuts. The Congress should not sidestep the issue by passing a general budget cut and then let the President take the responsibility for cutting specific areas such as education.

Section 401(b) of the supplemental specifically overrides the exemption Congress enacted last year with respect to education. Since this legislation overrides the exemption for education legislation we are now in a position, by acting upon the pending Yarborough amendment, where each of us will be called upon to stand up and be counted as for or against education. And we do this after we have seen schools closed down in Youngstown, Ohio, we have seen school years shortened in many cities across the country, we have seen schools that are literally falling down from age in every big city in this country and we have 5 million disadvantaged children who need special education programs. We also have about 6 million handicapped children who need special education programs. Is this the time to allow a cut in education funding?

The property taxpayers in this country simply cannot and will not signifi-

cantly increase local taxes to support education in this country. In my opinion the Federal Government has never carried its rightful share of the responsibility for education. However, we have been taking steps in the right direction in the last 4 years. The American people want more and better quality education for their children. Yet they cannot afford to provide that education from local revenues. The education needs of the children of this country are far too important to slight by passing general budget cut legislation when the specific needs for assistance under specific programs should be analyzed by the Appropriations Committee and by the Congress.

As chairman of the Education Subcommittee I cannot stand by in silence and let the Senate of the United States ignore today's education needs, nor acquiesce as this body diverts itself of its proper responsibility with respect to those needs. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to consider section 401(b) very carefully and ask these questions: First, should we continue a policy of legislating in appropriations acts in spite of our own prohibition against such legislation; second, should we relinquish primary responsibility for legislation by abdicating to the President powers which the Constitution does not grant him; third, do we want to close our eyes to the education needs of the Nation's children and elude our responsibility by enacting a general budget cut without a review of the needs of our children for education.

I would submit that the answer to each of these questions by most of us would be "No"; and if all three questions were put together I hope the answer would be a resounding "No."

Mr. President, I would ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I advise the Senator that there are not sufficient Senators in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I withdraw that request.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Rhode

Island whether or not any other Senators will appear in behalf of the Yarborough amendment?

Mr. PELL. The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTROYA) would like to be heard.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am ready for a vote.

Mr. PELL. Is the Senator from New Mexico being notified?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is up to someone else.

Mr. PELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending amendment, of which I am one of the cosponsors, but I want to say at the very outset that the fact that we are sponsoring this amendment should not be a reflection on the able leadership of my good friend from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), who has brought this bill to the Senate, and who has done a very fine job in bringing before the Senate a good bill, a well considered piece of legislation.

I would like to state that I completely support the language included in the vocational education amendments of last year which exempted our crucial education programs from the strictures of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act.

As you know, the wording of the Senate exemption language made the exemption a permanent one—effective not only for fiscal year 1969 but for all future years, unless specifically negated by subsequent legislation. And the House-passed version of the second supplemental appropriations measure now before us also protects the exempt status of education from this expenditure limitation. In short, we in Congress have recognized the urgent demand and need for funding educational programs—from elementary through graduate school.

Mr. President, I see no reason for Congress to reverse itself and backtrack on the principle it has endorsed of giving education the priority that it needs. The desperate need for expanded educational programs has by now been well documented and established. The unfulfilled promise of education for all is now our challenge and one to which we must accord top priority. But if education is to increase in the program sense, it follows that it must also increase in the financial sense.

If we move to repeal this language from the measure, it will weigh heavily on our consciences that large numbers of our boys and girls will fail to attain their full development. Not having a par-

ticular competence to get started in the world and to contribute to the life and economy of our Nation may turn out to be the single most important event in the lives of our youth.

Both precedent and commonsense tell us that our strength, creativity, and further growth depend upon our capacity to develop the talents and potentialities of our valuable human resources. Both precedent and commonsense also tell us that the few dollars we invest today in education are a capital investment which will pay off handsomely in social and economic dividends tomorrow.

This is a time in America for reason and restraint—but it is also a time for responding to and finding solutions to our major problems. If we can design a system to put a man on the moon, we can zero in on insuring that our educational programs live up to our expectations. The current climate in America places upon each of us awesome new demands for sound leadership and intelligent, constructive action. The goal of educational fulfillment is immediate and pressing; it cannot be evaded if we are to preserve the vitality of America.

I urge my distinguished colleagues not to create an educational crisis by pulling the rug out from under the young people of our country. There is little question that their education should appear in the highest ranks of our national scale of priorities. And by protecting the exempt status of education in this legislation, we shall all of us share in the excitement of achieving beneficial results in this crucially important field.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I recall one leadership meeting at the White House with President Nixon, at which time we were discussing a ceiling on expenditures and discussing the overall budget ceiling.

I recall that a Cabinet officer was there seeking to entreat with everybody that he needed another \$275 million for a particular function and activity in his department.

No one could deny that what he had in mind was a very desirable thing, and almost imperative in some sense; and, without putting words in the mouth of the President, he said, "Well, that's fine. If you need \$275 million, just find some other spot in this budget where they can take out \$275 million, so it can be done under the budget ceiling."

In other words, nothing was sacred, and everything could be cut except the uncontrollable items.

So that way, for the purposes of net lending and net loans, most of the items are there, and you can dip in, take out, and add; and that is precisely what the Senate committee did when they brought in this bill.

Now it is proposed to make an exemption here for the Office of Education, which involves a matter of \$3 billion. Obviously, the Williams amendment so far as personnel are concerned cannot be made to apply.

Well, if we are going to make an exception, why not apply it to the so-called impacted school areas? Why not also do it with respect to school lunches?

Why not do it with respect to all the public works projects that are in this bill? Why have any sacred cows at all?

But if we are going to pick out a sacred cow here—and already the telegrams indicate that a very effective school lobby is under way in behalf of this effort embodied in the Yarborough amendment—I sincerely hope that the Senate does not treat the Appropriations Committee quite like that, after all the effort that they have put into the bill.

I know, as a matter of fact, that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), who is the manager of the bill, and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), who is the minority manager of the bill, did sit down with the Director of the Budget to work out the language that the committee finally brought in here, for purposes of submission to the Senate.

Now, out of the clear sky, the old Morse amendment, with which we lived in other days, is resurrected once more, and a tearful entreaty is made that this has got to be done to round out the education of the youngsters of America.

There is a lot of school money in this bill, and if a little cut is necessary, or money has to be reserved by the President somewhere along the line, I have an idea it can stand it, and, in the interest of the solvency of this country, we should have no sacred cows whatsoever.

That is the reason this amendment ought to be defeated, for if it is not, in logic and with justification, any Senator can stand up here and pick out something in the bill and say, "I would like to have that exempted," and he can make a pretty good case for it.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like the RECORD to show that under the committee amendment to the House bill the impacted aid program remains exempted. The amendment to the reported bill which I am presenting on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) would reinforce or repeat an action taken by the Senate in October of last year, by a vote of 58 to 11.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, lest there be a misunderstanding about my position in this instance, or about my support for education, let me say that, to the best of my recollection, I have supported every education bill that has passed the two Houses of Congress since I have been in Congress, over a period of 17 years. Prior to that, I supported every educational measure that passed the State legislature of my State, when I served in both houses there for 6 years.

I first attended school in a little two-room schoolhouse back in Mercer County, W. Va., about 45 years ago. I grew up at a time when there was no Federal assistance to education such as we have today. I went to college while I was serving in the State legislature, and I attended law school at night, over a period of 10 long years, while serving in the two Houses of Congress, in Washington, to earn an LL.B. degree.

I do not say this with the idea that it is something that I should boast about, or that I should be applauded for. I

merely say it, Mr. President, to indicate my deep feeling for education. I know the worth of an education. I know the value of it. I have worked as hard as any individual ever worked, I would suppose, to get what little education I have. It has not been easy. I had to get most of my education after I had started raising a family, and I know what it is to have to study through the long evenings, past midnight, and on Sundays, when I would like to have been out with my family taking an afternoon drive around the countryside. I know what it is to have to pore over those boring books and get an education the hard way. So I am very sensitive when it comes to making cuts in educational appropriations.

I like to think that I have done as much as, if not more than, any other individual to promote education in the District of Columbia. I have been kicked around a little bit here, when I was chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia for 8 years—longer than any other Senator has held that post in the last half century—but I did more, I think, than any other Senator has done for education in the District of Columbia. I took moneys from other programs and put them into the education budget because I felt that the least we could do would be to give the children in the District of Columbia the opportunity to develop to the utmost whatever potential is within each child.

So, I, too, am a friend of education. I am not one who would close his eyes to the educational needs of the Nation's children. I never have done it. I am not doing it today, and I do not intend to do it tomorrow or the next day.

I voted for the educational amendment which was sponsored by our quondam colleague, Mr. Morse. I voted for it; but that was in a different context of circumstances. But when the committee held hearings on this bill, Mr. Mayo, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, came before the committee and said that the language that was included in the education amendments of last year should be removed, for this reason: If the President is forced to make a reduction in controllable expenditures as a result of this bill we are about to pass, and if he should allocate a share of the cut to each of the departments in the Government, and for example, should say to Agriculture, "You are to cut this much," and should say to Commerce, "Your quota is this much," and should say to the Justice Department, "Your quota is this much," and should say to HUD, "Your quota is this much," and should say to the Department of Transportation, "Your quota is this much," and should say to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Your quota is this amount"—let us say it is \$200 million—the Yarborough amendment would, in its practical effect, require that almost the entire cut would have to come out of health.

Why? Because the welfare programs are already open ended. There is very little we can do to control them unless the basic law is changed.

Education cannot be touched because education is being accorded preferential treatment by the amendment. But open

season can be declared on health programs because they have no such status. So, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would have to say, "Well, we cannot cut welfare, because those programs are uncontrollable."

He would say, "We cannot touch education, because that has been made an untouchable by the education amendments of last year and the Yarborough amendment. Therefore, we will have to take our whole quota out of health."

What does that mean? It means cuts in research programs for cancer, heart disease, and arthritis, cuts in the air pollution and water pollution areas, Hill-Burton hospital construction, and so on. All cuts would have to be made in health.

So, let us put this matter in its true perspective. All the committee is trying to accomplish is what Mr. Mayo asked to be done, and that was that the Office of Education, which is in the controllable expenditure area otherwise, be taken out of that preferred position. And it is the only area of controllable expenditures in the Government which has been so exempted and given this priority status by Congress.

If Congress, through the enactment of the pending bill, effectuates a reduction in expenditures of at least \$1.9 billion, the President will not have to make any cuts. But if Congress fails to do so, and if the President then has to make a \$1.9 billion cut, all we are saying and all Mr. Mayo was saying is that the President may be permitted to establish priorities, and that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may establish priorities and that they will no longer be forced to choose among health programs, to make reductions, but can, rather, make a choice between education and health programs. In other words, no longer would all education programs be given priority over all health programs, but under the committee language the President could decide which education programs have priority over which health programs and vice versa.

So, that is all we are asking. We are asking that this one area of controllables be removed from the untouchable category.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator has been saying. Do I correctly understand the amendment to relate to only one particular area of education, and that it does not cover the whole field of education?

It is my understanding that it does not relate to higher education. It does not relate to Headstart. It does not relate to manpower training and development programs, all of which are part of the education picture. It only relates to one area of education.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That area under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is laying great stress on his support for education. I would like to think that I share his support of education. However, this is not just an education matter. It is only a part of the education picture. It is not a matter of making education untouch-

able. It is a matter of forgetting about some very important areas of education such as the manpower training and development programs, Headstart, and others, and looking at only one part of the education picture.

Is that not the point of the Senator?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is exactly right, as I understand the Senator.

The amendment of the Senator from Texas applies to subsection (b) of the provision establishing a limitation on fiscal year 1970 outlays. That subsection would not become effective unless we in the Congress are unable or unwilling to reduce President Nixon's proposals for controllable spending in fiscal year 1970 by the \$1.9 billion required. If we in the Congress exercise our responsibilities and establish our priorities so that controllable spending does not exceed the \$84.3 billion we have set as a limit—within the overall limit of \$191 billion—there will be no need for the President to make any further reductions.

However, if we cannot so establish our priorities, if our appropriation and legislative actions result in controllable spending in excess of the \$84.3 billion we have established as a limit, we will then have forced the President to make the choices we have proved unwilling or unable to make.

For 1970 spending we will have approved, item by item, amounts for agriculture, for housing and urban development, for public works, for natural resources, for health, for education, for poverty, for the administration of justice and fighting crime, for foreign relations and foreign aid, for revenue collection and customs, for military—non-Vietnam—defense, and for everything else which we believe is of so high priority that we cannot reduce any of them. We will then tell the President that he must choose—that he must cut where we could not cut.

But the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Texas says to the President, in effect:

Even though all of these controllable spending items are so important that we in the Congress could not cut them by enough to come within the limit we have established, education is more important than any of the others. You may cut defense, you may cut agriculture, you may cut health, and so on, but you may not cut education below our approved amount.

Thus, the Senator's amendment says that even though these payments for education may not be of a fixed or open-ended, or mandatory type, the President has to nonetheless consider them so.

The Appropriations Committee, in approving the language that would be deleted by this amendment, did not want to single out education. Let me stress that the Appropriations Committee did not want to single out education. But the committee was faced with the fact that education had already been singled out by the education amendments of last year, and the committee's language was drafted for the purpose of removing its preferential position so that education and all other controllable spending items would be on an equal footing. The preferential status for education was con-

veyed by Public Law 90-576, approved October 16 last year.

That law, among many other provisions, amended the Elementary and Secondary Act as follows:

SEC. 401. The provisions of this title shall apply to any program for which the Commissioner of Education has responsibility for administration, either as provided by statute or by delegation pursuant to statute. Amendments to Acts authorizing such programs shall not affect the applicability of this title unless so specified by such amendments.

SEC. 406. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, *unless expressly in limitation of the provisions of this title*, funds appropriated for any fiscal year to carry out any of the programs to which this title is applicable shall remain available for obligation until the end of such fiscal year.

This last section limits the President's authority to carry out the purpose of title IV of the pending second supplemental appropriation bill unless we "expressly" provide otherwise. The amendment of my friend from Texas would remove such expressed provision.

As I have said, if we cannot fulfill our responsibilities to cut the required \$1.9 billion, the President will have to do the job for us. On the basis of the cutback actions taken last year, under the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, the President will apportion among the various departments and agencies the amounts which he will have to reduce. In this process, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, along with other Cabinet officers, will undoubtedly be directed to reduce 1970 spending by a certain amount below what we in the Congress will have specifically approved. Now, I know I am being repetitious, but I want to say again that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will look at the three major areas covered by his programs:

First. Welfare: He will find almost all of these expenditures are for public assistance grants which depend on State laws and caseloads, and under existing law the 1970 outlays will be mandatory or uncontrollable.

Second. Education: If the Senator's amendment carries, the Secretary will find that he cannot under the law I cited just a few moments ago, reduce any programs of the Office of Education.

Third. Health: These programs represent the only area where the Secretary would have some discretion, and hence he would have to take almost all of his budget cuts here. We in the Congress would have told him that we consider all education programs of higher priority than all health programs, and that means we will have directed that his cuts be made in such activities as food and drug control, air pollution, mental health centers, regional medical programs, Hill Burton hospital construction, Indian health facilities, and the National Institutes of Health—covering cancer, heart, stroke, and neurological diseases, arthritis, child health and development, and similar research activities. I have already stated that I share the feeling of many of my colleagues that education is of prime importance to the future of this

Nation. At the same time, I find it a little difficult to understand that everything that the Government does in education is more important than everything it does to prevent disease and to improve the health of our people—and also more important than everything it does in every other area of controllable spending. I believe the Senator's amendment should be rejected, and I hope it will be rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. On the point that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has raised, in trying to suggest that if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Rhode Island we are going to have to reduce the total numbers that are listed in section 401(a), the \$187.9 billion, by a relative increase in any additional amounts that are spent in the fields of education—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, I did not say that.

Mr. KENNEDY. The point I am interested in is that under the amendment of the Senator from Texas, it is my understanding that if there are any kinds of increases in the fields of education, the ceiling of \$187.9 billion will increase; and that, therefore, we really are not comparing education to health in terms of the total moneys that will be expended. For the language of the bill says that the ceiling shall be \$187.9 billion, "provided that such amount be increased or decreased by the aggregate amount" by which there are increases in the "uncontrollable" items, of which education would be one, under the amendment.

What is only being done is perhaps demonstrating additional interest or concern in terms of education by placing it in the proposed legislation as an express uncontrollable. But, certainly, in terms of expenditures, we would not necessarily be reducing any funds that would be used in health or in the Bureau of Indian Affairs or any of the other worthwhile areas.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I say, respectfully, that the Senator has missed the point of my argument, which is this: If this bill is passed with the expenditure reduction of \$1.9 billion intact, this means that either Congress or the President must make at least this amount of reduction. If Congress makes the \$1.9 billion reduction—

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am getting to the point.

If Congress makes that reduction, the President does not have to; but if Congress does not make it, the President has to. So if the President has to do this, he may have to allocate a certain portion of that forced reduction to HEW. If he does that, HEW cannot touch welfare, because most welfare items are open-ended and uncontrollable. That only leaves education and health HEW cannot touch education if the amendment of the Senator from Texas is adopted, because we will have said, "That is an untouchable. Don't put your finger on

one red penny." So, then, whatever reduction allocation is given to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to make, all will have to come out of health. It is just that plain and that simple.

Mr. KENNEDY. But the point remains that even if we include in this bill the Yarborough amendment, which has been brought up by the Senator from Rhode Island, in the total picture of increases and cuts the President may want to make some recommendations or cuts in other areas. He certainly can make that kind of adjustment. But adding the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the bill in no way will mean that, per se, there will be a reduction in the fields of health.

I think that the point is important, because some persons may have erroneously gathered from what the Senator from West Virginia mentioned earlier that, if we were to add the amendment of the Senator from Texas, automatically we were going to have to cut back on these health programs. No one says that the same amounts must be cut from the whole Department of Health, Education, and Welfare whether or not the amendment passes. Any, cutting back which may have been planned for education need not be made elsewhere in HEW. I suppose there would be those—and certainly I am one—who could reasonably assume that the President might find other areas for cutting back, such as the ABM or other areas depending on the kinds of priorities he might choose. I think it would be unfortunate if the Members of this body were to gather that the only area in which the President was going to be able to reduce expenditures was in the field of health.

This is something which is unclear from what the Senator from West Virginia stated earlier. If I am mistaken in that impression, I am glad to have it corrected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator is correct when he says that by virtue alone of the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas, we would not be saying, per se, that cuts have to be made in health. He is preeminently correct, and I hope I did not leave that impression.

But if the amendment is adopted, and if the President has to allocate some cuts to HEW—he might not have to; he might take them all out of Defense; he might take them all out of Agriculture; he might take them all out of public works—but if he distributes this cut around so that everybody takes a little bite of it, then some of it would go to HEW. If he does that, then the Senator's amendment would, in effect, say, "Take it all out of health, because all education programs are on a pedestal, and all health programs are candidates for surgery."

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOK. In our discussion the other day, when we talked about the controllable and the uncontrollable aspects of the budget, we were discussing the fact that we had gotten ourselves into a position where we were almost admitting

that well over \$115 billion of the \$187.9 billion was almost uncontrollable. By the adoption of this amendment, would we not just be increasing the amount of funds we would have to put in the category of being uncontrollable by the body that is supposed to control funds of this nature?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We would, and we would be going one step further. We would not only be saying that an additional area is exempt, but we also would be saying, for the first time, that a controllable area is exempt.

The other items that we have exempted in the bill—I think 100 percent of them—are either unpredictable as in the case of Southeast Asia support; or mandatory and fixed, such as interest on the national debt; or uncontrollable, such as public assistance grants and veterans' pensions, compensation, insurance, and so forth. But we have required that the controllables, which will amount to \$86.2 billion, are all available for whatever cuts the President has to make, with the exception of one controllable item—the Office of Education.

We are saying that one controllable item here—which is not open ended, not fixed, not mandatory, and not necessarily unpredictable, as are farm price supports in the face of unpredictable weather, unpredictable markets, and so forth—will be moved over into the uncontrollable category. It will be a fiction. We will say, "It is controllable, but thou shalt not touch it."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I sympathize with much that the Senator has said. The Senator from New Hampshire has served for a considerable number of years on the Appropriations Committee, and he has always served on the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare.

If the Senator thinks that this amendment is a sacred cow, I can inform him, from personal experience, that there already have been sacred cows; and if this amendment is rejected, those sacred cows will be frozen in.

For example, this Senator is particularly interested in the title III funds of the Defense Education Act—and, incidentally, so are the superintendents of schools and the school officials in every State of which I know.

Mr. President, those funds, have to be matched. The school authorities are eager to get those funds for use in equipping the schools in their respective States and they eagerly match every dollar we give them. On the other hand, the funds under the Elementary and Secondary School Act are all Federal funds. The States and the local communities do not have to produce a nickel for them. Those funds are all earmarked so that they go for many purposes, some of which are highly essential and some of which are not highly essential.

For some reason or other the Office of Education and, during the last few years the administration, have absolutely refused to ask for any money under title III of the Defense Education Act. In-

stead, they want to give it all to the Elementary and Secondary School Act.

We in the subcommittee have fought successfully to put back a small part of what we used to furnish under title III of the Defense Education Act. I shall not go into detail but it is a highly effective part of Federal assistance to education. We fought it through last year and succeeded in getting a small amount put back. The sum was a few million dollars. It used to be over \$100 million; it went down to \$70 million; then it became less than that, until they cut it all out. They always add it on to these other programs. We were able to get a few million dollars back, but every dollar we put in we took from somewhere else, some of it from the elementary and secondary school program, and some of it from other programs. We came out with the same but it was the will of the subcommittee, then it was approved by the Committee on Appropriations, and then the Senate, and we carried it through conference; and for the second consecutive year we were able to get that money.

Mr. President, if this amendment is not adopted we in the Senate will have fixed it so that we cannot have a nickel for that program. We cannot have the option in the Committee on Appropriations of putting some money in that program if we take it from another program. These moneys are not untouchable. As a matter of fact, the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Washington is now chairman has a record of holding down these funds. If we have gone wild anywhere we have gone wild on NIH and some of those very worthy projects. The money has gone there to a great extent. If this amendment is not agreed to the door will be closed and the hands of the subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations will be tied.

Even if this amendment is agreed to, none of these funds are untouchable by the committee and the Senate. There still remains a check. If I am not mistaken, if money is appropriated and it is given to the President, no power on earth can make him spend it if he does not want to. That is why I support the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what the Senator has said is just as applicable to public works projects. We may appropriate monies for public works projects but that does not mean they have to be or will be spent.

The Senate can do whatever it wishes to do in this matter. I do not have any particular feeling one way or the other. I am here today trying to manage the bill. I support the committee position and in this instance I think the committee is right.

Mr. President, I wish to read what Mr. Mayo had to say during the hearings:

Mr. Mayo. The reason we have mentioned specifically including amounts made available to carry out programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments, is that that is the only law, to my understanding, where, in substantive language, it says that the President, in effect, can't touch the education funds; that they are exempt from the ceiling by virtue of substantive language.

You could have erosion of the whole ceiling idea if bill after bill has substantive language that says, "Well, this takes precedence over any expenditures."

But the whole Office of Education is a \$3.7 billion exemption which isn't something we can sneeze at.

I just wanted to make clear to all of you what we are trying to do, and I felt it necessary to mention the Elementary and Secondary amendments just because it is the only exception that I am aware of that, in effect, has tied the hands completely of the President in terms of areas that he can touch or can't touch in the so-called controllable area.

Mr. President, I have received telegrams today. I am sure the same telegrams have gone to other offices. I certainly would not speak in derogation of the people back in the States who sent the telegrams. If I were a State superintendent of schools I would be contacting my Senators also, and if I were a Governor of a State I would be contacting my Senators. I do not know how much good it would do in most instances but I might contact them. The Office of Education has been busy overnight. But if the health people back home know what the Senator's amendment might do to health programs—not directly of course but in effect—we would get calls and telegrams from the departments of health back in the States and I am not sure the Governors would be choosing sides as between education on the one hand, and health on the other.

I recognize and appreciate the appeal which the amendment has. It holds the same appeal for me. I think I have yet to vote for the cut of a single penny in the Office of Education. However, I am simply trying to support a position here which I think brings the equities up to where on one side they equal the equities on the other side, and gives the President an opportunity to establish priorities and say what should be cut and what should not be cut.

Mr. President, that completes my presentation and I am ready to vote.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I have the highest respect for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I think there is no other Member of the Senate who is more diligent, dedicated, competent, or who works harder at the job of being a Senator than my distinguished friend from West Virginia. I regret, therefore, that I cannot go along with his thinking in this respect. I do associate myself very definitely with the remarks just made by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. Cotton), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in October of last year, during consideration of the vocational education amendments, the Senate approved an exemption of all education programs from the strictures of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act.

This exemption was based upon the sound principle that education programs

are among our Nation's highest priorities. I supported this mandate of priorities during consideration of the vocational education amendments. I now support continuation of the exemption of educational programs from any ceiling on Federal expenditures.

This year the House Appropriations Committee considered, but fortunately did not accept, Bureau of the Budget suggestions to repeal Office of Education expenditures from budgetary ceilings. The Committee on Appropriations has incorporated these Bureau of the Budget suggestions with regard to all Office of Education programs, except the impact aid for federally affected areas.

I cannot see the logic of exempting one Office of Education program while leaving other OE programs under funding restraints. Neither can I see the logic of having the Senate adopt language which may lead to budgetary savings at the expense of OE programs. The future of our Nation's children is at stake.

In the absence of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Texas, the present language of the Senate version of H.R. 11400 could destroy the utility of appropriations for educational programs which exceed the current budget estimates now before Congress. These requests have already come under scrutiny as being inadequate, and in view of this, I do not believe that language which allows further cuts would be in our Nation's interests.

While I am generally sympathetic to the objectives of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act, I think its application to educational programs would be penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am going to be brief. I have been given the opportunity to serve on the Educational Subcommittee ever since I became a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I have enjoyed it. I think that the programs have been good. I think that we have worked them out carefully. We need some changes in them, and we are working on them now.

Personally, I believe that education is one of the great national priorities in this country; but I am concerned with this amendment and I would like either the Senator in charge of the bill or the proponent of the amendment, perhaps, to answer some questions.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. On which side is the Senator? Does he know yet?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not know yet. That is what I am trying to find out. That is why I said either one.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let the Senator from Rhode Island answer. I have said enough.

Mr. DOMINICK. If the President is to make cuts, it is my understanding that he can point to HEW and make cuts out of the HEW program, as suggested by the Senator from West Virginia. It is also my understanding that

he would probably be able to make cuts in the higher education program. Is that correct?

Mr. PELL. That is not correct. All of the activities under the Commissioner of Education are included in the present exemption. But, so far as going down and making cuts in the health programs, the President is not directed to HEW, he need not make any cuts in HEW programs, but could turn to the Defense Department, the Department of Transportation, or in the Commerce Department—wherever he wants.

Mr. DOMINICK. I understand that, but I understood from the wording of the amendment that the Senator was exempting only the ESEA program. Is that correct?

Mr. PELL. That is not correct. It continues the exemption on all programs under the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. DOMINICK. So that every program, whether higher education or lower education, is included as an exemption in the budgetary limitation.

Mr. PELL. All educational programs under the Commissioner. There are some educational programs in Defense and some of so-called educational programs under Labor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes; but I meant the ones under the Office of Education.

Mr. PELL. Right.

Mr. DOMINICK. Then, if all those educational programs are included, is there any other area which the Senator can think of, other than Health, on which I serve as ranking member of the subcommittee, where they could make cuts in HEW if it seemed advisable to them?

Mr. PELL. Very small areas, such as the Office of the Secretary, but it will still remain the President's prerogative to decide, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, where in the whole budget the cuts will be made, and the decision will be made, whether to take the "pound of flesh" out of Health, or out of one of the other Government agencies.

Mr. DOMINICK. The thing that concerns me, and still does concern me, I might say, which is why I wanted more time to be able to ask some of these questions, is a situation in which the Executive is asked to make an x number of dollars cut, whatever it may be; and then the inclination, by and large, which I believe was followed by our previous President when this kind of restriction was put on, is to make cuts in all the agencies and thereby try to make the impact minimal on each one of them. That would be the normal thing, and one that I think is most essential to be done. Where the President has a number of agencies which thinks are important, and we except this agency from cuts, then we have, as someone put it earlier, a "sacred cow" which is not subject to this kind of action. Cuts can only be made in the health field, which is a political problem for anyone, and this is going to be very difficult for him to carry out.

Thus, what we are, in effect, doing is to exempt HEW totally from the areas within which the President might properly ask, under the law that we pass,

for an allocation of the funds which need to be reduced. Is that correct?

Mr. PELL. That would be a matter of choice, the President might well decide to make a cut in NIH, or he might find other offices in which to offset a cut.

Referring to the Senator's point about a "sacred cow," there are other "sacred cows" already exempted, including our own legislative branch.

Mr. DOMINICK. That is correct, in the impacted area A funds. I am sure that the Senator from Rhode Island, under whom I serve, and with great pleasure, as he is chairman of the subcommittee, recognizes the problem with impacted area A funds, but I feel something has to be done about the proposal on cutting out the class B allocation of funds. In my particular State, and I am sure in many others, it will totally ruin our lower educational system and we have got to do something about it. So that exemption, I think, is perfectly legitimate. The area B funds are an area in which there are no funds proposed, and which we must do something.

It also strikes me that the funding in other areas in the educational field is probably not adequate.

It is not adequate, in my opinion, because I feel that education is a priority item. But I would hesitate to say, when we are looking at a child's upbringing, we are going to take education first and not include in it some of the other things, such as the health program that he is talking about, and a variety of other cultural programs which we have been trying to form to encompass the whole man concept. That is what bothers me. We seem to have put the people in such a terrible bind in this question. Frankly, I am no further along in my thinking on how to handle this problem than I was earlier.

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) pinpointed magnificently the very problem I am talking about. It is really a tough problem to try to solve.

Mr. PELL. I appreciate the problem with which the Senator from Colorado finds himself confronted. While I am no great admirer of Ralph Waldo Emerson, who said:

A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds.

If the Senator has not been able to make up his mind, I would hope that he would vote the same way he did last October.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator is still in doubt, I suggest that the safest thing to do would be to stay with the committee.

Mr. DOMINICK. There are opposing recommendations from both sides, which is what I expected.

Let me ask one more question; then I shall be glad to yield the floor. Do I correctly understand the committee bill as it is written to mean that if Congress takes the necessary action itself to reduce appropriations to the level proposed, the President then would not have to do anything?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. Fundamentally, that is the congressional authority that we are supposed to exercise. Is that not also correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. Then what we are asking ourselves is, "Can Congress exercise enough responsibility to be able to take this action?" If we can, the President does not have to become involved in this problem.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. DOMINICK. I personally feel that more funding is needed than is suggested for health; that more funding is needed than is suggested for education, certainly in impacted areas; and probably in a number of other areas that I could point out.

The Committee on Armed Services is in the process of marking up the military authorization bill. It is one of the most difficult things I have been through in a long time. I do not think we have reached any decisions, but we are surely examining the bill very carefully. Obviously, efforts will be made both in committee and on the floor of the Senate to make changes in the proposed authorizations.

If we defeat this particular amendment, it seems to me that we will be saying that Congress is unwilling to discipline itself in order to get down to the figure that we think we ought to have. I would ask the Senator from West Virginia if that is not a valid statement.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, if the Senator refers to the committee amendment. I think that point can be made also of the whole enforced reduction. We are saying that if Congress does not have the necessary willpower or courage or foresight, or whatever might be required, to make at least a \$1.9 billion reduction in controllable items, the buck is then passed to the President.

We are saying that about the whole bill, but we do have a responsibility, and we will have an opportunity to make this reduction ourselves.

Last year—I refer to fiscal year 1968—Congress reduced appropriations in the amount of \$5,567 million. However, that amounted to only a \$1,907 million cut in expenditures.

Mr. DOMINICK. I understand that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But in fiscal year 1969 Congress cut appropriations in the amount of \$13,188 million. This amounted only to \$3,803 million in expenditure cuts.

So if Congress were to make reductions in fiscal 1970, which I think it will overall—I think the public is demanding expenditure cuts—and if we are to judge by the experience of the past 2 years, certainly Congress will be making cuts that are commensurate with, or even in excess of, the reduction required in this bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. In terms of figures, can the Senator tell me how much the appropriations would have to be cut in order to get down to the expenditure level as proposed in the bill?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do not think any definite figure could be set, but I will again cite the action of the Congress in fiscal 1968 as an example almost on target. It cuts \$5,567 million from appropriations. That resulted in an expenditure cut of \$1,907 million—exactly what we are seeking here, except for the seven million.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So what I am saying is that Congress or the President will have to make about three times as much reductions in appropriations as would be the resultant impact on expenditures.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from West Virginia will be glad to advise the Senate on this matter. I attended the meetings. I did not vote for the language we have in this respect, but I voted to have the bill reported finally. I know there must be some good reason for this, but the Senator suggested the figure of \$1.9 billion. How did he arrive at \$1.9 billion? If we are going to take \$1.9 billion out of expenditures, the Senator must have gone somewhere and taken some here and some there and some from some other place in order to reach that figure. I think that is why we are groping around here. Some of us would like to see some items cut. Others do not want to see cuts made in other items. I think it would clear up matters a great deal if the Senator told us what items were deleted to make the \$1.9 billion; what part came from education, what part from health, what part from public works, what part from any other items, to arrive at that figure. I could have asked the Senator at the meeting, but I did not get a chance to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I might answer that by simply saying, "Read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of what was stated on the floor yesterday and the day before." Senators who were present in this Chamber yesterday and the day before know the answer as well as I can explain it. I am not infallible, but I have done my best to explain it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Can the Senator quote the RECORD?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes; the Senator can quote ad infinitum, but all one has to do is read the RECORD. I do not say that disrespectfully.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. But anyone who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will have the answer; but I will state it again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been holding hearings, myself, on appropriations for the last 4 or 5 days. We have not had much chance to be on the floor ourselves. We have been dealing with another "small" bill called defense appropriations.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. What the Senator says is true. All Senators cannot be on the floor at all times. I realize that, and I am sorry that I spoke as I did to the Senator.

Let me see if I can explain it in this way again. Last year the President's

budget estimate was in the amount of \$186.1 billion. Congress enacted legislation to force a \$6 billion reduction, bringing the ceiling down to \$180.1 billion. There was to be a \$6 billion reduction in expenditures. Some items were exempted at the time, and other items were exempted later.

This year the committee sought to bring about what would amount again to a reduction of about \$6 million in controllable items.

Mr. Nixon made a \$4 billion reduction in the Johnson budget, and that was pretty difficult to do. The Nixon budget is \$192.9 billion. The Johnson budget was \$196.9 billion. So the President squeezed whatever water he could out of the budget, and squeezed it \$4 billion worth. That left \$2 billion that we sought to get at here to make a reduction total of \$6 billion.

I perhaps should have prefaced all this by confronting the Senate with what it would have if we took the House proposal. If we were to take the House proposal, we would set the ceiling at \$192.9 billion. That represents the President's budget estimate. We would take that as the ceiling, and we would say, "That is it. There are no programs exempt. Support for Southeast Asia is not exempt. Social security is not exempt. Railroad retirement is not exempt. Civil service retirement is not exempt. Foreign Service retirement is not exempt. Veterans pensions are not exempt. Interest on the national debt is not exempt. Farm price supports are not exempt. Postal operations are not exempt. Mandatory civilian and military pay increases are not exempt. Nothing is exempt. We have a \$192.9 billion ceiling, and that is it. If Southeast Asia costs go up, make cuts elsewhere. If Treasury bill rates go up after Christmas, causing interest on the debt to rise, Mr. President, you have the last 6 months in the fiscal year in which to make an offsetting reduction somewhere else. You may have to cut off twice as many people in the last half of the fiscal year to reach an average for the whole year but the ceiling is rigid. You can make up your own mind. You can take it out of education. You can take it out of health. You can take it out of poverty. You can take it out of the manpower training programs. You can take it out of farm price supports. You can take it from anywhere you want to, but the total of Federal expenditures, controllable and uncontrollable, must stay within the \$192.9 billion."

That would be unworkable, the committee felt.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Why? Why not let him make the decision?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Very well. Support for Southeast Asia was estimated, as of May 20, to be \$25.2 billion next year. This may be a controllable item, but it is certainly unpredictable. Let us say the war in Southeast Asia heats up, or next March, let us say, President Nixon comes to us and says, "Members of Congress, we have to make additional expenditures, which would be \$2 billion above the \$25.2 billion, for 1970 in Southeast Asia." Well, we would give it to him, but he would be faced with the \$192.9 billion ceiling. He would

have to cut out \$2 billion in expenditures from other programs to stay within the \$192.9 billion ceiling. The only way that ceiling could be raised, under the House bill, would be through Congressional action or inaction, and if Congress appropriated the additional moneys in response to the President's request, this would not constitute action by the Congress in the context of the House language. If the Congress appropriated an amount in excess of or less than the amount requested by the President, this would then constitute action by Congress to the degree that it varied from the President's request.

So, as I say, the President would have to make offsetting reductions elsewhere to stay within the House ceiling.

That would put him in a terrible strait-jacket. I can then hear the telephones ringing: "Mr. President, don't cut my public works program. Mr. President, don't cut my poverty program. Mr. President, don't cut my farm price support. Mr. President, don't cut the education program; take it from somewhere else, but not here."

The Senate committee was confronted with this problem, so the Senate committee has sought to come up with an alternative; and in that alternative, we have tried to bring about roughly a \$2 billion cut in expenditures which, when added to the \$4 billion cut made by the President already, would make about the same size cut made last year.

I do not think there is any Senator in this body who would venture to wager that if the Appropriations Committee had not worked out some proposal providing for some kind of expenditure reduction some Senator on the floor would not have had us do it right here. We felt it was better, therefore, to work out a proposal in the committee than to try to hammer it out on this floor. So this was the best we could do.

This, I hope, explains the \$2 billion target.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If I may just finish one statement.

The exact figure of \$1.9 billion comes from reducing the President's budget of \$192.9 billion by \$5 billion, to \$187.9 billion, which would be a ceiling, and then by adding to that ceiling the estimate of the amount by which the expenditures in 1970 for uncontrollable items would exceed the amount spent in fiscal year 1969 for uncontrollable items, and the very best, latest, and most up-to-date estimate we could get from the Bureau of the Budget is \$3.1 billion, as being the amount by which the uncontrollables next year will exceed the uncontrollables this year.

So we exempt that \$3.1 billion, which in effect raises the \$187.9 to \$191 billion. That would be the new ceiling; and then the \$191 billion, subtracted from the President's revised budget estimate of \$192.9 billion, leaves \$1.9 billion. That is how the figure was arrived at.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand the Senator, then, he takes as his base figure that which we did last year. Is that correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I see nothing wrong with that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Assuming that Congress is going to do with the appropriations that which we did last year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Namely, \$6 billion under the budget.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I will tell you why we did that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the Nixon budget is considerably less than last year's budget; so to arrive at the \$6 billion, you would have to cut expenditures still further, would you not?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I will tell you why we did that. We thought the President had reduced the budget as much as he could, getting \$4 billion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; that is what I think.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I will tell you why we took \$6 billion: Not only because that is what Congress enacted last year as a forced reduction, but also because it has worked out in practice just about that way. Congress and the President together actually made about a \$6.7 billion reduction in expenditures in fiscal year 1969; but the increase in uncontrollables has reached \$6.2 billion, which, except for the difference of \$.5 billion, washed out the expenditure. So the one just about balances the other.

We take the same figure, \$6 billion, and have an alternative to what the House of Representatives has proposed which we think is uncertain, indefinite, and unworkable.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to discuss with the Senator from Rhode Island the relationship between the authorizations and the appropriations for the Office of Education.

As I understand it, since 1967, going through 1968, 1969 and then fiscal year 1970, in President Johnson's budget and now in the present administration's budget, we have had rather dramatic and significant reductions in education appropriations relative to authorizations. First of all, the absolute amount of funds appropriated or requested has recently been dropping. Second, with regard to those funds authorized, we have seen a very dramatic reduction in the percentage of funds which have actually been appropriated of those that were authorized.

Mr. PELL. That is my understanding of the sad history of education authorizations appropriations and budget requests.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to read some figures, in each case referring to fiscal years. In 1967, there was authorized \$4,638,921,402, and appropriated \$3,676,595,967. Percentage-wise, that means that in 1967, 84 percent of the funds that were authorized for Office of Education programs were actually appropriated.

In 1968, approximately \$6.4 billion was authorized, and approximately \$4.1 billion was actually appropriated, giving us 63 percent of the authorized funds actually appropriated.

In 1969, there was \$7.4 billion authorized, and only \$3.6 billion actually appropriated, making 49 percent of the authorization that was appropriated.

In 1970, \$8.8 billion is authorized, and

\$3.5 billion, or 40 percent, was recommended in President Johnson's budget.

In 1970 under the Nixon budget, we still have the same authorization, which is \$8.8 billion, but we have only \$3.2 billion requested, which is only 36 percent of the funds that was authorized for the Department of Education.

This is extremely serious and genuine cause for alarm, when we see such sharp cutbacks in percentage of authorizations actually appropriated or requested—and in absolute appropriations in an area as critical as education. When we talk about including the Yarborough amendment in this bill, what we are really saying is that a cut back to 36 percent of authorizations is certainly too much, and that above all, we do not want the figure reduced any further.

As to the question of whether this is an unreasonable kind of position to take, given the history of this provision, which shows that the Office of Education was permanently exempted last year and that the House retained the exemption and did not knock it out in this bill, I think that this really dramatizes the significance and the importance of the Yarborough amendment in terms of priorities and in terms of the priority we place on education.

Mr. PELL. That would appear to me to be absolutely correct.

In addition to that, if there was ever an item that should be all growing, it is education, where the demand, the number, and the needs are moving upward with far more unpredictability than I would hope would farm support prices, interest on the national debt, and other so-called uncontrollable items.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PELL. Certainly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In support of the position taken by the Senator from Massachusetts, we have been hearing this afternoon the cost of the Vietnam war and of course want to support our men. But it is my understanding that cost is less than one-third of the total military budget; and we all know, based on superb work done by the Senator from Wisconsin in the Joint Economic Committee, that there is heavy waste in the military budget.

A figure had been given that the original budget for ammunition alone in Vietnam—and I certainly want to see as much ammunition as is necessary out there—was more than double the total amount of Federal money, primary and secondary, requested for aid to education.

When I called attention to this matter, the answer was, "Yes, but we have heavily cut the money for ammunition, primarily because of the reduction in B-52 raids."

So I looked into that, and found it correct; but after that reduction, the remaining amount appropriated was still more than double the total requested for primary and secondary education.

As the Senator knows, I am one who for many years, on this floor, has been advocating a reduction in expenditures. But I believe a reduction in expenditures for further education of American youth

at this time would be just as inadvisable as a reduction in military expenditures, where now it is so clear we have much waste, would be advisable.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I concur with the Senator from Missouri and point out that the amendment merely continues the present practice of exempting education.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to add to the list of names of 36 Senators already cosponsoring the amendment the names of the junior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the junior Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), and the junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of expenditures—not authorizations, not appropriations, but expenditures—by the Office of Education covering the years 1965 through 1970.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation covering expenditures by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for health programs in those same years.

There being no objection, the tabulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970 ¹
Controllables:						
Elementary and secondary:						
BA.....	97	1,308	1,457	1,668	1,477	1,415
Outlays.....	68	937	1,365	1,479	1,370	1,402
Higher education: ²						
BA.....	653	1,124	1,541	1,260	812	796
Outlays.....	162	373	777	1,058	1,057	1,083
Vocational education:						
BA.....	166	253	278	263	248	279
Outlays.....	124	132	244	259	242	255
All other programs:						
BA.....	192	209	283	378	577	518
Outlays.....	128	113	230	309	386	597
Subtotal, controllables:						
BA.....	1,108	2,894	3,559	3,569	3,114	3,008
Outlays.....	482	1,555	2,616	3,105	3,055	3,337
Uncontrollables:						
Impacted areas:						
BA.....	390	438	469	530	521	202
Outlays.....	350	410	447	506	406	400
Vocational education, permanent:						
BA.....	7	7	7	7	7	7
Outlays.....	7	4	6	6	7	7
Land grant colleges, permanent:						
BA.....	3	3	3	3	3	3
Outlays.....	3	3	3	3	3	3
Subtotal, uncontrollables:						
BA.....	400	448	479	540	531	212
Outlays.....	360	417	456	515	416	410
Grant total:						
BA.....	1,508	3,342	4,038	4,109	3,645	3,220
Outlays.....	842	1,972	3,072	3,620	3,471	3,747

¹ Nixon budget proposals.

² Including construction loans and grants.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—HEALTH PROGRAMS 1965-70

[In millions of dollars; omits medicare, medicaid, etc., which are uncontrollable]

	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970 ¹
Health manpower (medical schools and health professions student):						
BA.....	(?)	119	196	164	172	218
Outlays.....	(?)	25	62	72	109	161
NIH and NIMH (including St. Elizabeths Hospital) (cancer, heart, arthritis, and other diseases):						
BA.....	1,071	1,248	1,406	1,738	1,586	1,600
Outlays.....	790	914	1,156	1,457	1,436	1,606
Hospital construction (Hill-Burton):						
BA.....	267	303	314	293	258	154
Outlays.....	203	200	208	259	232	278
Direct care (PHS and Indian hospitals):						
BA.....	127	141	155	167	185	192
Outlays.....	126	132	147	159	185	190
Partnership for health:						
BA.....			4	141	176	214
Outlays.....				63	146	186
Regional medical programs:						
BA.....		25	45	59	62	100
Outlays.....			4	24	51	87
Other public health:						
BA.....	461	419	572	376	390	356
Outlays.....	284	322	444	365	389	384
Total:						
BA.....	1,926	2,255	2,692	2,938	2,829	2,834
Outlays.....	1,403	1,593	2,021	2,399	2,548	2,892

¹ Nixon budget proposals.

² Not separately identifiable.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, would the Senator mind reading those figures into the RECORD for the benefit of those Senators who are present?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Certainly. Mr. President, for the health activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the outlays in 1965 amounted to \$1.4 billion. In 1970, the outlays for health activities will amount to \$2.9 billion. In other words, the expenditures were doubled for health activities in the period 1965 to 1970.

The outlays by the Office of Education for education in the year 1965 was \$842 million. That figure starts lower, of course, than the expenditures for health in that year. However, in 1970, education expenditures had risen to \$3.7 billion, which is roughly 400 percent higher for education than in fiscal year 1965, as compared with an increase of about double for the health activities in the same period.

Again by way of comparison, the final figure in fiscal year 1970 for education is \$3.7 billion and \$2.8 billion for health.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to urge the Senate to amend title IV of H.R. 11400 to continue to exempt educational programs from the strictures of the budget ceiling.

When the educational exemption was enacted last October, the Congress properly placed itself on record as recognizing the importance of education to our national development. In effect, we were telling the executive branch that our national priorities demanded that needed budget cuts come elsewhere.

The House-passed version of H.R. 11400 preserves the exempt status of education from the expenditure limitation. However, the phrase, "including amounts made available to carry out programs to which title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments is applicable," found in section 401(b) of the Senate version of H.R. 11400 constitutes a specific negation of the education exemption.

If enacted, this phrase will serve as a Senate invitation to the Bureau of the Budget to impound increases for education. Congress may vote in the Labor-HEW Appropriation Act of fiscal year 1970 and use these funds for other programs. In view of the urgent need to improve and expand American education, such a development would indeed be tragic.

Therefore, it is my fervent hope that we will move to amend title IV of H.R. 11400 to remove this dangerous phrase.

Mr. President, our Nation has made great strides in increasing the availability of a college education. Years ago a college degree was an accoutrement of social class, a privilege reserved for the rich. As our Nation grew, so did the number of colleges and universities. Government made a tremendous contribution to this growth in higher education. Today, any academically qualified student

is virtually assured of admission to college.

But the assurance of admission does not mean that the academically qualified student is assured of a college education. Tuition charges and educational expenses are substantial, even at public universities; and each year these expenses rise 5 to 10 percent. Many students are unable to meet the costs of college. Thus, in America today, a financial test is still imposed on those who would seek a college education.

Many forms of financial aid are provided by the Federal Government for meeting the costs of college. But for some qualified students, this aid is not enough. In many cases it is simply impossible for the student and his family to make up the difference. I believe that the Government has an obligation to help, through the educational opportunity grants program, to make college education truly available to all.

Not only does EOG close the financial gap, but the direct grant it offers may be the decisive factor in convincing the qualified student that college can be a reality for him. For those in the backwash of our prosperous economy, the prospect of 4 years of financial struggle, and incurring debt of thousands of dollars, all for the seemingly remote possibility of securing a share of the economic well-being that has heretofore passed him by, may appear an insurmountable obstacle. An EOG grant to such a student can not only assure him that the costs will be met if he does his part, but it can also serve as a certification of our faith in him, to convince him that the commitment to college he is about to make is a worthwhile one.

The restoration of \$16 million to the educational opportunity grants program will mean that, for the coming academic year, college education will be available to 32,000 more students. Every day we spend over five times that amount in pursuit of "victory" in Vietnam—in the form of brief control of a barren jungle hill, or impermanent vindication of a questionable foreign policy.

In contrast, this supplemental appropriation for EOG will be spent to build, rather than to destroy, the lives of our youth. It will be a lasting investment in America.

In strict economic terms alone, the benefits of such an investment are great. With the increased earning power of college graduates, the recipients of EOG grants will be able to make better lives for themselves and their families. And they will make a substantially greater contribution to our economy as a whole.

But perhaps even greater than the economic benefits are the social ones. We have always been proud to say that ours is an open society, in which everyone has the opportunity to advance freely. But for too long, that promise has been an empty one. A college education is an important tool which the deprived can use to take advantage of the opportunity for free advancement. But to those for whom financial requirements bar the door to college, true freedom of oppor-

tunity is indeed a myth. The resulting disillusionment and apathy not only poisons the lives of those directly affected, but weakens American society. Self-respect for all Americans can only come when the hopelessness borne of economic deprivation is eradicated.

The educational opportunity grants program is structured so as to be optimally effective in making available a college education. First, a student is only eligible if the costs of his education are not covered by other available forms of aid and self-help. This insures that Federal funds are spent only on those who would not otherwise be able to go to college. Thus, as the student continues through college, it is less likely that he will need an EOG grant. In fact, of the 123,000 students who received an EOG grant during the 1966-67 school year, only 28,200, or 23 percent, will be receiving a grant 3 years later, in the coming 1969-70 school year. Yet without the initial grant, college would have been impossible for all of these students.

Second, the recipient must match his EOG grant with aid from other institutional sources. The program thus promotes cooperation and coordination among various institutional sources of aid, and encourages the private sector to contribute its share.

Third, since work-study funds now qualify for matching EOG grants, the Government aid provided to the recipient takes the form of enabling the student to help himself. Between one-fourth and one-third of the funds used to match EOG grants are provided by work study. In those cases where self-help is not enough, EOG makes up the difference—but still lets the student make a full contribution on his own.

In addition, the EOG program serves all our citizens, black, Indian, oriental, and caucasian—if they have the requisite financial need. In fact, a high percentage, almost 75 percent of EOG recipients are not Negroes. And it enables them to attend all kinds of institutions; 60 percent of the recipients attend public universities, and 40 percent attend junior colleges.

We must not forget that a college education, which the educational opportunity grants program makes available, may not be the appropriate tool with which all the economically deprived can improve their lot. But those with financial need who are qualified for college must not be shut out of American life. The restoration of \$16 million to the educational opportunity grants program means that the door to full participation in our society will be opened wide.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. Without a favorable vote on this amendment, we will undo one of the most constructive steps taken last session when we supported the principle that the education programs passed for the benefit of our Nation's children and youth should be exempt from any administrative cuts necessitated by spending limitations.

Last year, by exempting these education programs from such cuts, we stated clearly that education was to be given a top priority. Are we ready so soon to repudiate this action?

If we do, our actions will speak very clearly for us. We will say to the young people who are only now beginning to benefit from the educational programs designed to enhance the educational opportunities of the disadvantaged that we do not think these programs are really worth protecting.

We will say to educational administrators, on the State and local levels, who thought they could plan based on certain projected levels because these were programs specifically exempt from cuts, that you cannot count on Congress because we removed this assurance at the first opportunity which presented itself.

It is indeed a paradox that while enjoying the fruits of unequalled prosperity, this Nation may spend less for education next year. The need for increasing our commitment to the continued improvement of our educational system has not lessened, and we must not weaken our commitment to this worthwhile objective.

I hope this amendment will be adopted so that we may be certain that the education of our youth is to remain as one of the top priorities of this Nation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May we have a vote, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) on behalf of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and other Senators to the committee amendment on page 71 of the bill. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 37 Leg.]
YEAS—52

Allen	Harris	Murphy
Bayh	Hart	Muskie
Brooke	Hartke	Nelson
Burdick	Hatfield	Pastore
Cannon	Hollings	Pell
Case	Hughes	Percy
Church	Inouye	Prouty
Cotton	Jackson	Randolph
Cranston	Javits	Ribicoff
Dodd	Jordan, Idaho	Schweiker
Dominick	Kennedy	Scott
Eagleton	Magnuson	Spong
Fong	Mathias	Symington
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tydings
Goodell	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Gravel	Mondale	
Griffin	Montoya	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Ellender	Pearson
Allott	Ervin	Proxmire
Baker	Fannin	Russell
Bellmon	Goldwater	Saxbe
Bennett	Gurney	Smith
Bible	Hansen	Sparkman
Boggs	Holland	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Stevens
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Cook	Long	Thurmond
Cooper	Mansfield	Tower
Curtis	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Dole	Mundt	
Eastland	Packwood	

NOT VOTING—5

Anderson	McIntyre	Yarborough
McGee	Moss	

So the amendment offered by Mr. PELL on behalf of Mr. YARBOROUGH and other Senators to the committee amendment on page 71 was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) for the courtesy, care, and handling of the amendment. I also wish to pay great credit to the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) for without his original impetus-groundwork and message to so many of our colleagues this amendment would not have carried. I regret that he could not be with us today, but even in his absence, he played a very important role in the passage of this measure.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator for his remarks. The Senator is to be congratulated for his excellent presentation of the matter here today. I wish to express congratulations to the distinguished Senator from Texas, in absentia, who did an excellent job yesterday in lining up sponsors for the amendment. Had he not done so, the amendment may not have fared quite so well today.

PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the manager of the bill whether he can anticipate how many other amendments are pending.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have the Chamber cleared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair requests that the Chamber be cleared of all unnecessary personnel.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I can see a number of attaches who do not have any business here. I ask that the order of the Chair be enforced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms is requested to carry out the order of the Chair.

The Senator from Illinois is recognized. Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thought perhaps the manager of the bill could inform Senators as to other amendments he anticipates.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be in order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In response to the query from the distinguished and very able minority leader, I think I should state that the vote now recurs on the committee amendment as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think I should ask for a rollcall on the committee amendment as amended because we have to go to conference with the amendment.

Then, I would anticipate a vote on the committee amendment repealing section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of last year. That measure deals with the 3-out-of-4 vacancies proposition. I assume the able Senator from Delaware will oppose the amendment and I would further assume that we might have a rollcall vote thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield. Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Inasmuch as the merits of our argument are recognized the Senate might just reject the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I would anticipate a rollcall vote on the amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

I would hope we could have those three votes and if we can I think the chances might be good, if the hour is not too late, for us at that point to have a final vote on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have an amendment on which I presume there will be a rollcall vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that would make four yea-and-nay votes, and we have two orders recognizing Senators who wish to make speeches.

Does the Senator anticipate finishing the bill today?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I wish to say that my earlier anticipation of finishing the bill today is becoming more clouded by the minute.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL
11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making

supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I would like to express the hope that we can now proceed to vote on the committee amendment as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on—

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment and ask that it be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

After line 16, page 71, insert the following new paragraph 5:

"(5) the programs of health under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. My amendment is the same as the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, except that it applies to health and other programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Since the other amendment was accepted, mine may be somewhat in self-defense. I think that we who handle the HEW appropriation are going to be placed in an unfortunate position if it is possible for the President to cut the HEW budget, which he may well do, and take it all out of health programs.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Why not include public works and the school lunch program?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us put in all the rest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I might put in public works.

Mr. President, it is difficult for me to differentiate between health and education. I think they go hand in hand. As in the case of many Senators, I have tried to do my part and have accepted the responsibility for the health, education, and welfare of the Nation. I do not think we have gone too far on appropriations for health. I have been associated with this matter for a long time. The first bill I introduced in Congress that was passed was in 1938; it established the Cancer Institute. I was then a Member of the House of Representatives. The Senate passed this bill unanimously. As I recall, the bill was introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Washington, Homer Bone. The bill had 95 cosponsors out of 96 Senators. One can understand, therefore, why it passed unanimously. That was the beginning of the National Institutes of Health, which was more or less devoted, at that time, to military research—and it was doing a fine job—but it was the beginning also of all those important nonmilitary medical programs we now call the National Institutes of Health.

I remember we finally got the then-enormous sum of \$1 million to start it, because it was during the war. There was a very distinguished resident of Mary-

land, a widow, whose husband had died of cancer, and she donated the land in Bethesda where the NIH is now located and where her house still stands. The Bethesda Naval Hospital, which became a part of this great complex, is located there too.

Over the years, even during the war years, we kept alive a program of Government research—a program that has been greatly expanded since. The Government, of course, has not done it all, but it has been responsible in many cases for putting the seed money into laboratories, medical schools, and other schools which have done such good work in so many fields.

As a result, good doctors, good laboratories, and trained personnel working in all the various programs made possible the increase in life expectancy of the American people by 7.6 years in the past 17 years alone. That is worthwhile, is it not? If only the life insurance companies would adjust their rates accordingly! Just think of it—7.6 years longer to live. Yet, there are those who suggest that this may have been too much. Sometimes we do get carried away emotionally on the subject of health. But I say Government expenditures along this line have been most worthwhile over the years.

Mr. President, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education and Welfare, under the able chairmanship of the former Senator from Alabama, Mr. Hill has done a good job in keeping this money flowing. I suspect that Congress will not be miserly this year, but if the budget on health is apt to be cut disastrously, it will slow up some projects that we know are now in the process of bearing fruit.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I want to say that I favor the Senator's amendment. I have been on the Appropriations Committee for 9 years, and during all of those 9 years I have served on the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, 7 of those 9 years as ranking minority member.

I had the privilege of working with our beloved former Senator from Alabama, Lister Hill. We sought to be reasonable and not to be carried away by emotion, as the Senator from Washington just touched upon. For instance, last year, when he had to face the fact that in dealing with the artificial kidney we were dealing with a situation where, at present, doctors are compelled to decide who lives and who dies because of the fact that there are only so many kidney machines available and research is going forward now to try to make them general so that we do not have to confine them to certain individuals. That research has not been completed.

I am confident that under the leadership of the Senator from Washington, with whom I have been privileged to work with all these years, the committee will handle this most carefully.

I have constantly been in the position of keeping down appropriations, but this is in a very sensitive area, a humane

area, and I feel that it is one which is in an entirely different category from public works, or any other.

I commend the Senator from Washington for offering the amendment, and heartily support it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator. We have made so much progress that it goes almost unnoticed—people take it for granted. We have abolished many of the TB wards in the 179 veterans hospitals in this country. There are, of course, a few TB patients left, but we used to have large wards all over the country. We have also made great progress in heart diseases and in all kinds of nervous diseases.

One reason I am concerned about this—and I am going to tell the Senator from West Virginia that we are going to be reasonable—is that I do not want to be limited in advance if we need to do something new and dynamic in the field of health.

One of the things that very few people in this country realize is that every other bed in a veterans hospital is a mental case. Just think of that—every other bed in a veterans hospital is a mental case—50 percent. Many people walking around, who do not have the benefit of a veterans hospital, are also victims of mental illness. We are making great progress in that field through research. Federal Government funds are being used to test tranquilizers and the whole program of mental health. We hope, of course, that the proportion of Federal funds can be cut down.

One other thing, we used to be able to do research directed to this program. I am just citing some examples. If a person lost a leg, it would take weeks and months before he could be fitted with an artificial leg. Sometimes it took a year.

Now we have a new process evolving, through funds available for research, where a man can be fitted with an artificial leg in 3 weeks.

We have got a long way to go in the field of cancer. I am somewhat disappointed in the rate of progress, but it is a fact that we have saved literally thousands of lives with what we have learned so far.

The so-called Pap test for women, for example, has saved literally hundreds of thousands of lives because we had the seed money available for research.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was necessarily absent from the floor yesterday and did not hear the debate, but I am wondering why, if a reduction in appropriations for expenditures for fiscal 1970 is so desirable, should not the Senate face up to the situation and limit appropriations for each department for 1970 instead of including the limitation as an amendment—virtually an amendment—to a supplemental bill for 1969 which applies only to appropriations which are expendable during the next two weeks? Why do we not face up to that—

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thoroughly agree with the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. And assume our proper responsibility?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was sure that we would not do that on the supplemental but we did. We had to do something. I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that we had experience with an alternate. If I had my way, I would have cut the language out altogether and gone to conference.

Mr. COTTON. As a matter of fact, will this not be a vote of no confidence in ourselves?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator, but as long as welfare is exempted, and as long as education is exempted, we cannot fail to exempt health as well.

I do not want to be in the position, since I handle the multibillion-dollar appropriation bill for HEW, of having the cuts taken out on health.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that is the argument I was making against the preceding amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not disagree with the Senator on the basis that we had to have an alternative to the House provision. We would be better off if the House had done nothing. We are going to save money, but I will not know which programs should be cut out and which should not be cut until our subcommittee holds hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. If the House limitation of \$192.9 billion was wrong, is the Senate limitation of \$187.9 billion better? How does that make it better?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The answer is not that easy. It is not a matter only of saying that \$192.9 billion is wrong and \$187.9 billion is right. It is a question also of whether we want to take \$192.9 billion and say, "that is it. There are absolutely no exemptions from that. Whether they are uncontrollable, mandatory, unpredictable, fixed—whatever—there are no exemptions."

I think I understood it was also said that what we should have had from the committee was nothing; we should just have stricken the House provision and gone to conference. Well, we have been doing that too long. The Senate has an equal responsibility to legislate here. Let us do what we ought to—that should be the approach—and then go to conference and wrestle with it there. I do not want to go to conference after doing nothing except to strike the House provision. I have been in conferences with the House Members. They are tough. If the Senate wants a reduction in Federal expenditures, it should take a stand. If it does not want a reduction, it should take a stand. If it wants to present an alternative for the House-Senate conferees, that alternative should be hammered out on the anvil of discussion. The committee has proposed an alternative to the harsh proposal offered by the other body. The Senate now can vote as it wishes on that alternative. I will not lose sleep tonight over the Senate's decision. I have already lost sleep over it. Senate conferees should go to conference with a definite proposal in a matter of this nature unless it wishes to agree with the House proposal. That is why we have wrestled and worked on

this, so we can go to the conference and say, "Here is the Senate's proposal. Now let us sit down and reason together"—in the words of a former President—"and resolve our differences." But to merely strike it out and go there would result in our being at the full mercy of the House, which has perhaps had rollcall after rollcall, in committee and on the floor. I think we ought to try to come up with something we think is better. The House conferees may prevail in conference, but they will have to prevail through persuasion and by showing us they have a better proposal than that which the Senate has developed. Perhaps the end result will be a modification and blending together of the two proposals.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from West Virginia will agree that the Senator from Washington has a job to do on the Appropriations Committee, too.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes; and the Senator from Washington does it well.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have been on the Appropriations Committee for many, many years. What I was bothered about was that we are now just starting on HEW appropriations. The House has not passed that bill. I do not want to see, in a supplemental bill, rules and guidelines that tie our hands in advance. We would be waiving our responsibility to make our own decisions, based on the facts and evidence relating to Health, Education, and Welfare. That was the only thing that bothered me about it. I think I should do what I have proposed—if the Senator wants to put a limitation on my appropriation after I bring the appropriation before the Senate, the Senate can work its will. Right now I agree with the Senator that when we start on the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation, with the bill as it now stands, health is going to be at a disadvantage.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield on this point, the Senate and House can still make cuts in excess of the \$1.9 billion if desired. The Senator's committee can still make cuts regardless of what is provided here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator mean the Senate does not have to follow this?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senate can cut or not. It does not bind the Senate's hands. But the reduction will have to be made by someone—the Congress or the President.

I think there is good argument in having this matter thrashed out on the supplemental appropriation bill. We are almost at the end of the fiscal year. We are almost at the beginning of the new fiscal year. This is the time to enact a forced reduction in Federal spending, so the President and the Congress both will know at the beginning just how much of a cut will have to be made during the fiscal year. If Congress waits until the new fiscal year is half gone before making a decision to enact a forced spending reduction, the implementation of that reduction will be more difficult and the swing of the ax will have to cut

deeper to make the whole year average come out the same as if action had been taken at the start of the new fiscal year. Now is the time, and the best time, to make that decision, before the new year starts on July 1. If the Senator does not wish to vote for a reduction now, it is perfectly all right with me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure it will be all right with the Senator. The Senator and I each vote our own way in accordance with our own conscience. We have done this for a long time. As a matter of fact, one of the nice things about the Senate is that it does not seem to change the respect of Senators for each other for them to vote their honest opinions, which may be different.

I would not have brought this matter up if it were not for the fact that the two big items of HEW are exempt. Yet here is health standing vulnerable by itself. I know what we have done in the field of health. I know the Senate wants to do what it can. We will do our share in keeping appropriations at a reasonable level.

For years, I handled the Independent Offices appropriations. Last year that bill was cut a great deal. Over the years we have cut about \$6 billion out of that bill. Those cuts are sometimes easier to do there than in the field of health.

I am not going to be emotional about it, but I cannot separate health and education in this country. I think they go together. That is why I submitted the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

IN THE MATTER OF THE MINORITY LEADER

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, on the morning of January 15, 1969, Dr. John H. Knowles, an eminent Massachusetts physician, was invited to Washington by the then Secretary-designate of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, and offered the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs, the No. 1 health job within the gift of the executive branch to give a medical doctor.

Dr. Knowles accepted.

Since that offer was made and accepted, one hundred fifty-three days have come and gone and yet the matter of Dr. Knowles' appointment has never come before the Senate of the United States.

The question, of course, is why?

Is it, Mr. President, a question of Dr. Knowles' qualifications?

Obviously, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare does not think so. The President of the United States does not think so. The American Public Health Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Nurses Association, and the American Hospital Association—they, together, do not think so. Nor do I believe that a majority of the Senate, if given the opportunity to do so, would do anything less than vote overwhelmingly to confirm Dr. Knowles as Secretary of Health

and Scientific Affairs, and thereby enthusiastically endorse his qualifications.

If I may, Mr. President, let me tell you why I believe Dr. Knowles deserves, if nothing more, a chance to be considered by the Senate of the United States.

First, on the basis of his record alone, he is unquestionably qualified to be the Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs.

Qualified, because as Director of the Massachusetts General Hospital, Dr. Knowles, in assuming the leadership of a great hospital, helped to make it even greater. That quality, the quality of leadership, is of vital importance to the top health job in the U.S. Government.

Qualified, because during the 7 years he has been director of Massachusetts General, Dr. Knowles has sought to broaden the ways in which a hospital can serve the needs of a great city, and his success in this critical area is acknowledged by even his critics.

Qualified, because Dr. Knowles, though responsible for administration, has never lost sight of a doctor's first calling—caring for his patient's needs. This able man sets aside 2 months out of every year to work as a physician in the wards of Massachusetts General.

Qualified, because with all of his responsibilities, as varied and as difficult as they are, Dr. Knowles has still found the time to write more than forty papers and a textbook on respiratory physiology, while at the same time becoming a cardio-pulmonary specialist.

Qualified, because as a member of the American Medical Association, Dr. Knowles has participated in many long-range planning studies to improve the quality of medical help in this Nation, and knows, perhaps better than most of his peers, that the AMA can make an even greater contribution to national life.

Qualified, because as a sometimes lecturer at Harvard University, Dr. Knowles understands the critical need for more physicians in the United States, and the great difficulties we are going to encounter unless we can find a way to interest more young men and women in the medical profession.

For all of these reasons, and more, I believe that Dr. Knowles is more than qualified to be Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs.

Qualified to assist in the more than a dozen pieces of legislation which must be considered for extension in the area of health this year and which desperately needs the help of a man like Dr. Knowles.

Qualified to give valued counsel on the more than 100 bills already introduced this session of the Congress on matters pertaining to health and which clearly indicate the sense of priority the Members of Congress give to this vital area.

Qualified to help determine the ways and means by which the Government can most effectively invest over \$13 billion in medical research and health-care funds; an investment in the future health security of this nation.

Qualified to give expert leadership to the policy direction of medicare and

medicaid, as well as helping to bring before the bar of public opinion those doctors who have excessively profited by overcharging medicare and medicaid patients and who have in the process robbed the taxpayers of this country.

If so highly qualified a man as Dr. John Knowles has not been nominated, it is then incumbent upon the Members of this body to ask the question, "Why?"

Mr. President, I have considerable regard for my distinguished colleague and our minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN. Few men equal his accomplishments in a congressional career spanning nearly 40 years. He has been a friend of Presidents and a leader in the U.S. Congress.

Through dedication to hard work and a disciplined mind, Senator DIRKSEN quickly rose to prominence as a leader in the other body to which he was first elected. His colleagues recognized him as an expert on the tasks he chose to master.

The test of any man's desire for leadership often rests in his determination to overcome physical affliction. Indeed, the crucible of physical affliction has often foreshadowed the rise of men to leadership positions. So it was with Senator DIRKSEN. He confounded medical experts predicting loss of his eyesight. He retired from the other body, spending 2 years to recover from his affliction. Then he ran for the U.S. Senate, defeating another minority leader in a race most thought he would lose.

Dedication. Discipline. Determination. These qualities brought Senator DIRKSEN to the Senate, and they soon propelled him to the position of minority leader. Each of us remembers specific occasions when Senator DIRKSEN's leadership qualities made meaningful contributions to our Nation's progress. I especially remember his constructive leadership role in obtaining the passage of meaningful civil rights legislation.

But leadership also bears the earmarks of another quality in a democracy. The quality is simply to allow those who are led to be effectively heard.

Why is it that the nomination of Dr. Knowles has not been sent to the Senate for consideration? Why is it that Members of this body have not been permitted to work their will on this vital matter?

There are two reasons. The American Medical Association and the minority leader of the U.S. Senate.

No one organization, no one man should be permitted to dictate or to veto a Presidential appointment of one so eminently qualified as Dr. Knowles. Yet, this is clearly the case in the present instance.

The American Medical Association, through its president, has expressed opposition to Dr. Knowles' appointment. Senator DIRKSEN has said he would block that appointment if the President submits it to the Senate.

Speaking only for myself, as an individual Senator, I would like to have the opportunity to debate the qualifications of Dr. Knowles in this Chamber. I do not believe that is too much to ask of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I challenge the minority leader, my leader,

to advise President Nixon and Secretary Finch that he will no longer arbitrarily block consideration of Dr. Knowles' appointment. I challenge the minority leader to allow the Senate to work its will.

One hundred and fifty-three days have passed, and one of the Government's most important positions remains unfilled. Others have waited; I have waited. I will wait silently no longer.

I stand here now, as a matter of conscience, to oppose the leader of my party in the Senate.

I stand here now, because I believe very deeply in two principles.

I believe in the right of the President to nominate those men he believes can do the best job.

I believe in the right of the Senate to work its will on persons nominated by the President.

These principles, essential facets of our Government, are being violated, and the confidence of the American people, the ultimate strength of any democracy, is being shaken.

There are many rumors to the effect that the appointment of Dr. Knowles is now dead. If that is so, the democratic process has lost a battle and the public interest has suffered a grievous defeat.

I believe it is in the best interest of the American Medical Association and Senator DIRKSEN to say they are unafraid to have Dr. Knowles' appointment openly considered by members of the U.S. Senate.

The appointment of Dr. John Knowles should rest on its merits.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 265. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction-differential subsidies;

H.R. 1808. An act for the relief of Capt. John W. Booth III;

H.R. 2037. An act for the relief of Robert W. Barrie and Marguerite J. Barrie;

H.R. 2209. An act for the relief of Carlo DeMarco;

H.R. 3373. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Delina;

H.R. 3377. An act for the relief of Frank Kleinerman;

H.R. 3560. An act for the relief of Arie Rudolf Busch (also known as Harry Bush);

H.R. 3666. An act to amend section 336(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

H.R. 4658. An act for the relief of Bernard L. Coulter;

H.R. 5107. An act for the relief of Miss Maria Mosio;

H.R. 5337. An act for the relief of the late Albert E. Jameson, Jr.;

H.R. 9946. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in certain tracts of land to the Board of Education of Lee County, S.C.;

H.R. 11069. An act to authorize appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 11235. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 9946. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in certain tracts of land to the Board of Education of Lee County, S.C.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 11069. An act to authorize appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore in the State of Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 1808. An act for the relief of Capt. John W. Booth III;

H.R. 2037. An act for the relief of Robert W. Barrie and Marguerite J. Barrie;

H.R. 2209. An act for the relief of Carlo DeMarco;

H.R. 3373. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Delina;

H.R. 3377. An act for the relief of Frank Kleinerman;

H.R. 3560. An act for the relief of Arie Rudolf Busch (also known as Harry Bush);

H.R. 3666. An act to amend section 336(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

H.R. 4658. An act for the relief of Bernard L. Coulter;

H.R. 5107. An act for the relief of Miss Maria Mosio; and

H.R. 5337. An act for the relief of the late Albert E. Jameson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11235. An act to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to perfect my amendment, which was drawn in a hurry, with a modification that states more clearly my intended meaning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the proposed modification.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 71, at the end of line 25, add a comma and the following: "except that no such reservation may be applied to health programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am in a position which I think forces me to oppose the amendment. I do so because if we are to be serious about enforcing a Federal expenditure reduction on ourselves and on the administra-

tion, then we cannot continue to exempt one after another of the very important programs in which we all believe and many of which are our favorites.

The committee started out by exempting unpredictables such as support of the war in Southeast Asia, mandatory and fixed items such as interest on the national debt, and uncontrollables such as farm price supports and public assistance grants.

The committee then took the remaining controllables and said they had to be cut by \$1.9 billion. But each time from here on out that he removes one of the controllables and puts it into the exempt class, we do not do anything to the \$1.9 billion reduction figure, but we do narrow by that much the remaining controllable category from which that \$1.9 billion has to be cut.

So, in the vote which was taken a moment ago, the Senate said in effect that \$3.7 billion of that \$84.3 billion which was in the controllable category is going to be removed from that category and exempted from any forced reduction.

The Senate is now being asked by the distinguished and able Senator from Washington to remove an additional \$2.9 billion from that category that it, too, along with the Office of Education, may be given preferential status. So, the cheese is becoming a little more binding all the time.

I am just as much in favor of expenditures for health as is any other Senator. I do not recall ever having voted to cut an expenditure, but I have voted to increase expenditures. My worthy colleague is now taking the position I took a while ago when I said, "If you take the Yarborough amendment, you are going to open up health for larger cuts."

I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Washington stated in his own presentation here that that is precisely what we would now do unless we have this amendment in addition to the one already adopted.

We can carry this even further and say that we ought to exempt farm price supports. We can say that we ought to exempt vocational rehabilitation. We can say that we ought to exempt IDA—the economic International Development Association. I voted against the appropriations for IDA in the committee. However, "what is done, 'tis done."

We can go on down the line and say, "We want a \$1.9 billion reduction, but we want to exempt everything from that reduction. We do not want to make a cut anywhere."

So, we march up the Hill and say we have got to have a \$1.9 billion reduction. We march up the Hill with the banners flying, bugles blaring, and the drums beating and we thrill to the tumultuous cheers of the multitude along the wayside as we pass.

Then we about face and march down the Hill and say, "We do not want to cut here and we do not want to cut there or somewhere else."

That is the position we will be in if we continue to lift out of the controllable category those very worthy programs and activities such as health and education. What will be the next program

for favored treatment in this discriminatory pattern? I think Senators were against discrimination.

We either have to mean what we say, that we want to make a reduction in controllable Federal expenditures, or we must say, "We stand for an overall reduction in Federal spending, but do not believe us. We are just kidding. We do not mean what we say. We are not going to let you touch this or that item."

That being the case, I have to oppose the amendment.

It is just like opposing motherhood and the flag and God. Fortunately, I have never been put in a position yet of opposing those three. However, if we continue at the rate we are going, we may find that there is nothing else left to oppose.

I have to oppose the amendment and stand by the will of the committee if the committee's proposal is to mean anything.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I must confess to the Senator from West Virginia that as a freshman Senator, this reminds me of the many times I watched the activities of the Congress of the United States when it said to the President that it had to cut the budget by so much money. Then, everyone sat in the Senate and proceeded to put it all back.

I think that many of the people listening today may well be missing the point that we have said to the President of the United States that we want the budget cut from what it was under the last recommendation of a little over \$200 billion. And all of a sudden we come along and say in the pending bill that it shall not exceed \$187.9 billion with the exception of some uncontrollables. Then we add other uncontrollables and still other uncontrollables.

It is kind of like saying that we have a nation that really wants a tax reduction and a reduction of the budget, but somehow or other we want the wide highways, free beer, and motherhood. Somehow or other we cannot have all three. Somehow or other when the day of reckoning comes, the reckoning really will be to the effect that we will have opened up everything. And when it comes to appropriations, we would have cut out all of the controllables and made our budget to tally uncontrollables.

I can only say to the Senator from West Virginia that he is fighting a great and wonderful battle. However, in my argument with the Senator 2 days ago when we talked about the controllables and uncontrollables, it really means that we sit here and say that out of some \$187.9 billion, the Senate is capable of controlling some \$80 billion and totally incapable of controlling the remainder.

I think it becomes quite a game that we play. I am not certain how it appears in the newspapers when published, but it is a little disillusioning.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator.

The pending amendment has as much appeal as the last amendment agreed to

by the Senate. However, if we are going to make expenditure reductions, we will have to cut out some programs in which we all believe.

I think we have to remember that there are a lot of housewives who go to the butcher shop each week and see the prices on breakfast bacon going up and up and up. Inflation is taking pennies out of the dollar.

Federal spending constitutes a major cause of inflation in this country, and we must do something to half it.

Congress imposed a surtax. I voted against that. I would vote for a surtax if I were convinced that the Federal Government had done everything it could possibly do to stop wasting money on programs and activities that are not meritorious and to improve the efficiency in administration of others. Thus far, I am not convinced that it has done this.

If we are serious about fighting inflation and about the need for raising taxes and taking money away from American businesses and the working man and woman to fight inflation, we have to be equally serious about curbing our appetite for more and larger Federal programs and Federal expenditures. The soundness of the dollar both at home and abroad is at stake. The equity of our actions against those we force on businesses and consumers by siphoning off some of their earnings in taxes is an issue. If we are to defend the value of the dollar, we must defer many things until a more appropriate time, no matter how desirable they might seem. This is what Congress is asking wage earners to do with the income tax surcharge. It is what we are asking businesses to do with both the surcharge and the pending repeal of the investment tax credit, and it is what we have to do to the growth of Federal spending.

If we raise taxes and raise spending too, we continue to place a double bite on our people both through taxes and increased prices.

The way to help all our people, but particularly those with low incomes, with fixed incomes, and with no available reserve of savings, is to get control of the trend on ever-increasing prices we all have to pay just to live. We cannot get the cost of living under control if we continue to spend a little more here and a little more there in the hundreds of places where we all agree a little more might be desirable. We must distinguish between what we have to do and what we might like to do if conditions were favorable. Conditions are not favorable when prices are rising and when our action of a little more here and a little more there will be self-defeating by making it even more difficult for our people to buy the essentials of life. I am talking about that housewife who, in the face of a fixed income or a low or moderate income, would like to put some breakfast bacon on the table once a week, but who, because of spiralling prices, is prevented from doing so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are not determining the health appropriation in this

amendment or in this bill. We may eventually cut the health appropriations even more than the Senator from West Virginia suggests by his amendment. We just did not want health to be in a position different from that of education and welfare.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am aware of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I say that we are not determining the health appropriation today. We are going to determine that after hearings.

As for the woman who goes to the market, I want to see that she is alive and healthy, too.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So do I.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And that her children have every opportunity to have the best of medical care and research.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator does not stand in a position different from that of the Senator from West Virginia, in that respect.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I concur in the argument that the Senator from West Virginia is making today. I only wish I had been able to convert him yesterday. The argument I made yesterday is valid today. Once Members start selecting their pet programs for exemption they have a job to argue against selecting others.

The Senator from Washington has brought up a proposal to exempt the health program. He made a very good argument. An equally good argument can be made for several other programs.

For example, yesterday Congress did exempt price-support programs for agriculture products. Congress exempted all of the Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures, the food for peace, the school lunch program, and so forth. Congress has exempted all public assistance grants, including medicaid. Congress has exempted the Post Office Department. Congress exempted itself, the legislative branch, from any controls in Government spending. Congress has exempted the judiciary along with many others, and these were controllable items—just as controllable as are the items involved in the pending amendment.

I say that as one who will not support the Senator from Washington, but I did not support the exemption for those other programs either.

I think that once we move into the area of selecting those to be exempted Congress will end up exempting everything and end up with no control and no ceilings. I said yesterday—and I repeat—that we need valid expenditure ceiling, but with all due respect, we do not have one before us now, with or without the amendment of the Senator from Washington. The amendment of the Senator from Washington may open the door a little wider; but the big barn doors are open now, and I do not see any difference in opening another door. Congress has already claimed that it wants to cut spending, but when the chips are down it does not want to cut spending on any of its pet programs.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON).

It seems to me that no governmental activity is entitled to more special attention than health. This is true of all of the health programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is particularly true of the Indian Public Health Service. I call the attention of Senators to a statement I made on March 26, 1969, on the introduction of S. 1691, pointing out the serious problems caused in the Indian Public Health Service by last year's limitation on personnel. We should not make this worse. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Washington to the committee amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 38 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Aiken	Gore	Mondale
Bayh	Harris	Montoya
Bible	Hartke	Muskie
Brooke	Hatfield	Nelson
Burdick	Hollings	Pastore
Cannon	Hughes	Pell
Case	Inouye	Prouty
Cotton	Jackson	Randolph
Cranston	Javits	Ribicoff
Dodd	Kennedy	Schweiker
Dominick	Magnuson	Spong
Eagleton	Mathias	Symington
Fong	McCarthy	Tydings
Fulbright	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Goodell	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NAYS—47

Allen	Ervin	Packwood
Allott	Fannin	Pearson
Baker	Goldwater	Percy
Bellmon	Griffin	Proxmire
Bennett	Gurney	Russell
Boggs	Hansen	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Smith
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Sparkman
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Cook	Jordan, Idaho	Stevens
Cooper	Long	Talmadge
Curtis	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dirksen	McClellan	Tower
Dole	Miller	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	McGee	Saxbe
Gravel	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hart	Moss	

So Mr. MAGNUSON's modified amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from West Virginia, the action which the Senate has just taken on the last two votes suggests to me the wisdom of including in the Senate provision on the limitation of spending a provision which is found in the House bill. I would like to refer the distinguished Senator from West Virginia to page 70, lines 7 through 14. I have at the desk an amendment covering this point, but I should like to discuss it with the Senator first.

If I may read the language, for the benefit of the Senate, it is as follows:

Provided, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth therein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

Mr. President, we have heard persuasive and eloquent arguments this afternoon urging us to exempt education and health from the limitations imposed by the bill. We are just at the beginning of the appropriations process in Congress, and we will be considering many appropriations bills before we are through. It therefore seems to me that we should include in the bill a realistic recognition of the fact that, from time to time, individual Senators will want to ask the Senate to consider adjustments based upon the merits of, say, water pollution, education, and various other programs. I think it is wise to adopt a ceiling at this point, recognizing the President's recommendations and undertaking to set a benchmark for us to follow. We know, if we are intellectually honest about it, that from time to time, during the course of this session, we may want to consider variations from the President's budget recommendations which may or may not breach the ceiling.

The language I have read here, which was included in the House bill, gives us a procedure for handling it without being dishonest about it.

Thus, I should like to propose the amendment and would like to get the reaction of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

I have discussed it with him earlier and he seemed somewhat receptive to this approach.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I think that the distinguished Senator's suggestion is a very important contribution here. Unless this is done, the President—certainly the Congress—would not be kept informed as to the expenditure impact resulting from in-

creases cuts in or appropriations that Congress might make.

I think it is important that Congress be kept informed of the expenditure impact of its appropriation actions.

I would ask the Senator if he would be willing to go one step further. I am glad he has called this to our attention. I think the proviso should be in the bill and I wonder whether he would go one step further and add subsection (b), which was stricken from the House language, and which merely states that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will make these reports beginning the first full month after the passage of this act, and each month thereafter, during the first session, and then once each quarter thereafter, through the end of the fiscal year, so that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will not have to inform the Congress of the expenditure impact immediately following each appropriation cut or appropriation increase but he will have a time set forth in which he would be expected to make such a report to the Congress and the President.

Mr. MUSKIE. Yes, I think the Senator's suggestion is well taken. I would be happy to include it in my amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. So, Mr. President, if the Senator will so modify his amendment, I will gladly accept it as modified.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield at that point?

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, my amendment is at the desk and I offer it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 71, after line 16, insert:

"Provided further, That whenever action, or inaction by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: Provided further, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this simply requires that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget inform the President and Congress at certain intervals as to the impact we have made through our cuts or increases in appropriations on the \$1.9 billion expenditure reduction required by the bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield for a question?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator's amendment, if adopted, will it automatically eradicate from the bill the two rather inconsistent provisions which have just been adopted?

Mr. MUSKIE. No. This amendment does not touch that at all.

Mr. COTTON. It does not change the ultimate amount fixed as a goal by the Senate in the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. I wish it would eradicate these other actions, not the goal, but the inconsistent provisions we have adopted.

I highly commend the Senator for offering the amendment. I am entirely for it. I think that this matter of setting up a ceiling works exactly opposite to what is intended because every Member, consciously or subconsciously, thinks that he can vote for any kind of appropriation he wants to and that because there is a ceiling, it is not going to do any harm because the President or someone else—some nebulous authority somewhere—will balance the books. The result is that we simply promote our own irresponsibility.

I felt that the entire House provision was much superior to what has been proposed by our committee in the Senate. I wish the Senator's amendment had started as a clean slate. I shall take pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. MUSKIE. I may say that I was tied up elsewhere, or I would have offered it earlier this afternoon. It might have forestalled some of the action taken.

I think this amendment will assure orderly consideration of any changes the Senate wants to make in any appropriation bill as we go through the entire process in the weeks ahead.

Mr. COTTON. I certainly commend the distinguished Senator from Maine for his proposal.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I read the language in the House bill. I followed the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator. But I am not sure I understand how it works. Suppose in a given appropriation bill Congress saw fit to disallow a request, say, of \$100 million for something within the President's budget. What would happen if the amendment the Senator proposes were the law?

Mr. MUSKIE. Then the Director of the Budget, as I understand it, must report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action on expenditures and net lending and on the limitation set forth in the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Aside from reporting it, what else happens?

Mr. MUSKIE. The language reads:

The limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

Mr. CURTIS. That is what is unclear. Does it mean, then, that if the Congress saves \$100 million in one instance, the budget ceiling is thereby lowered \$100 million, or does it mean that that saving does not go to the taxpayers or to the Treasury, but makes it possible to raise some other item in the appropriation process? I do not think it is clear what the language, that the ceiling shall be appropriately adjusted, means. Adjusted to what?

Mr. MUSKIE. As I understand it, it is the duty of the Director of the Budget

to keep a running record of the net impact and net result of the adjustments in appropriations made by the Congress from the President's budget estimates. Those figures should be available to us on a running basis, but, in any case, under the second part of the amendment, we would have a formal report at the end of each month.

Mr. CURTIS. But what does that change? That is my question.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. May I answer the question first? What is changed, if there is a change, is the spending ceiling.

Mr. CURTIS. Changed in what way? If the Congress saves some money, if the Congress declines to appropriate, say, \$100 million, does the ceiling then come down \$100 million, or does the ceiling remain the same and that money is available for some other purpose?

Mr. MUSKIE. As I understand it, it would go up or down depending on the nature of the adjustment Congress has made. Let me say this is language from the House bill. I am not certain of the House interpretation of the language, but, as I read the language—and this is what attracted me to it—I think the effect is to change the ceiling up or down depending on action the Congress takes with respect to each appropriation bill.

Mr. CURTIS. So the more we save in the appropriation process, the lower the overall ceiling becomes?

Mr. MUSKIE. That is as I understand it.

Mr. CURTIS. I think it is most unclear what it means.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I will ask the distinguished Senator from Maine if it does not mean exactly this: that every time the Senate cuts an appropriation, every Senator knows he is reducing the aggregate appropriations for the year, or at least at that point he is reducing them by so much, and every time we exceed it, everyone who votes for it knows he is voting to push up the aggregate spending for the year. Consequently, there is an incentive every time we vote, either because we are pushing it up or we are doing the praiseworthy thing, in most cases, of reducing the ultimate spending.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is exactly as I understand it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If it is true that our actions on an appropriation bill result in exceeding the President's budget, and we therefore raise the ceiling established in this act by that much, which means that we have no ceiling—that we have a ceiling until we vote money to raise it—does not the language become meaningless?

Mr. MUSKIE. No. I agree that that is the effect, but I say that does not render the action taken today meaningless, in my judgment. We are setting the ceiling. The Senator knows, from the experience we had in the Senate last year, that the

setting of the ceiling did not act as a prohibition, subsequently, against increases in spending by the Congress—our approved increases for controllers in our airport towers, for example.

I am saying here, let us set a ceiling, which operates as an inhibition as much as it did last year, but if we subsequently change it, as I read the language, we get the impact in figures from the Director of the Budget. The country gets it. The President gets it. We get it for whatever influence it will have on our votes on those appropriations.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend that part of the amendment which directs the Bureau of the Budget to send down that information. I think it is a good thing for the Congress to have, and I think it is a good thing for the public to have, and I think it is a good thing for the President to have. We call it a ceiling, but it is a sort of telescoping process—if the Congress continues to increase appropriations, the ceiling always goes up.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not think it changes what it is going to be, anyway. I may say to the Senator I think it is a recognition of the realities at this point.

Mr. CURTIS. I think, in light of the language adopted, what the Senator is saying is correct—you cannot have a ceiling and have holes in it.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. It is not a fact that this is not a ceiling, because it never has been and it never will be? It is a goal. I think the Senator, in his earlier remarks, referred to a hallmark. But it is a goal rather than a ceiling. It is a goal we set for ourselves. We know, and everyone who knows the appropriating process knows, that is all it is and all it was last year. But the people do not know it. I agree with the Senator that this approach is the most honest, and also puts every Senator on his clear duty and notice that when he casts a vote he is either bringing that goal nearer or else he is pushing it away. Therefore, we are not divesting ourselves of personal responsibility.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. May I make one comment in response? Then I will yield to the Senator from Florida.

To do otherwise is to suggest that we adopt as a ceiling the President's budget estimate. That is delegating to him the appropriation process. We have the duty, and the privilege, I think, of evaluating these budget estimates for ourselves and passing judgment on them, increasing them or decreasing them; and we do both. It seems to me that by setting a ceiling as a goal, and still preserving the realistic recognition of our own duty and still continuing a role in the appropriation process, we are being realistic and honest.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to call attention to the fact that we are talking about two different things. The proposed ceiling is a ceiling on expenditures. The matter

which will be reported to us and which we might otherwise not know is the question of how our reduction or increase of appropriations—not expenditures—will be reflected in the expenditure budget for 1970.

That is information we need to have. It is information that does bear on the success of our efforts. I think this is a good proposal. However, we should very carefully distinguish between the two things, because the amendment would provide that when Congress exceeds or goes under the request of the President for appropriations or other budgetary proposals—as for contractual authorizations—that fact should be reported by the Bureau of the Budget to the President, and the Budget Bureau should report to the President and to Congress how that action affects the expenditure budget for 1970. Otherwise, we will not know that.

Suppose we pass an appropriation bill in October, as we have done many times, and the appropriation was not designed, in the beginning, to be spent in 1 year, but we know now that the 1 year's portion is going to be spent over a lesser period than 1 year. The Director of the Budget will know when he will begin to approve payments from that appropriation—in other words, when the administrative setup has been completed—and can report to us how much will be expended out of that appropriation prior to June 30, 1970.

I think this is a good provision, and something like it is the only way in which we will be able to keep up with the effect on the expenditures budget of our own action on the appropriations budget. I wish to make that point very clear.

Mr. MUSKIE. I think the Senator from Florida. The Senator is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and more experienced at interpreting this kind of language than I; so I appreciate having his comments as a part of the legislative history.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this is the second straight year that members of the Appropriations Committees have recommended that Congress impose limitations on expenditures, and there are strong arguments for such limits in light of the inflationary pressures on our Nation's economy.

But arbitrary ceilings threaten to cut the budget of the hunger programs while millions starve, to lower investments in education programs when the education of so many of our young people is clearly inadequate and to undermine the commitments we have made to water pollution control programs, housing construction, medical care, summer jobs, and poverty programs. Most of these programs have not even been funded at half of their authorized levels. Crying needs have gone unanswered.

All of us are aware of these needs. Many of us have gone before the Appropriations Committee to request higher appropriations for programs to which we are deeply committed; others will make similar requests later in the session.

America faces a problem of priorities, and Congress has taken the lead in trying to carve out America's new priorities

and to implement them. We are already restricted in our efforts to deal with the critical problems that face the Nation by the pressures of inflation, and it would be a grave mistake to further restrict our options by imposing the strict ceiling on expenditures which the committee has recommended.

The ceiling is retained as a goal, but this amendment incorporates the House-passed provisions that congressional decisions on increasing or decreasing appropriations for particular items may adjust the ceiling up or down.

The President has made cuts in the budget, and the Congress should respect his decisions in setting an initial ceiling. It is on agreeing to the amendment of the budget and increases in others that the Congress may wish to make in the next few months. There is no reason why we should tie our hands this early. Therefore, I urge the Senate to accept the alternative language which I now offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment of the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as I understand it, the pending vote is on the Byrd committee amendment, as it has been modified by all the exceptions that have been thought of up to this point. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am one who has advocated a ceiling on Government spending. I think we need a ceiling on expenditures. I was the author of the first expenditure ceiling which went through Congress last year as part of the tax increase bill.

I said then and I feel now that when Congress considers the question of increasing taxes it is just as important that Congress consider what it is going to do with spending as well as what it is going to do with bringing in additional revenue; and if we were only going to raise taxes for the purpose of bringing in \$8 billion or \$10 billion more to pour into the spending stream, as far as I am concerned we are only defeating the purpose and creating more inflation. I happen to be one who thinks that many of the private citizens have as much intelligence and sense about how to spend their dollars as does some bureaucrat in Washington.

The so-called ceiling we have before us today is a ceiling in name only. I shall vote against it. I will not be a party to supporting a principle which apparently seeks to give to the American people the idea that Congress is launching an economy drive and that we are putting a ceiling on expenditures. In reality Congress is doing nothing of the kind, but rather here today the Senate has laid the groundwork for the largest spending spree that has ever been conceived, greater than those of either the Johnson administration or the Kennedy administration.

I wish to review briefly just what these exemptions for various programs mean mathematically; and if anyone wishes to take exception to my figures as we go along and point out where I am in error I

shall be glad to yield at any time because I think this is one of the greatest farces ever suggested, as far as the American people are concerned.

We start out with the committee proposal of a ceiling of \$187.9 billion on expenditures for fiscal 1970, as compared with the ceiling that was projected in the House of Representatives amendment of \$192.9 billion.

On the surface that looks as though the Senate were saving \$5 billion. But let us see what we are doing.

No. 1, we start out, on page 71, paragraph (1), where we find reference to the open ended programs and fixed costs in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States. They are exempted to the extent that the expenditures for those programs in fiscal 1970 exceed the 1969 level.

Let us refer to page 16 of the budget. As the first item there we find social security, medicare, and social insurance trust funds. This exception adds \$2.9 billion as an expected increase over the 1969 budget. That automatically—and I emphasize the word automatically—raises the committee ceiling of \$187.9 billion by \$2.9 billion, and we now have a ceiling of \$190.8 billion.

The next item exempted is interest on the national debt. That is projected at \$800 million over 1969; so that adds another \$800 million, and we now have a ceiling of \$191.6 billion.

The next item exempts all civilian and military pay increases. These are the ones that are supposed to go into effect July 1 and were referred to in the President's message yesterday. In 1969 there was nothing for that item, because these salary increases do not go into effect until July 1, 1969, but the cost of these increases is projected as an extra \$2.8 billion for the 1970 fiscal year; so, therefore, that is another automatic increase, bringing the ceiling up to \$194.4 billion.

The next exemption is the public assistance programs, including medicaid. That adds another \$1.1 billion, and we have a ceiling now of \$195.5 billion.

Farm price support programs are estimated in this budget as being \$500 million less than last year; so we subtract the \$500 million and are back to \$195 billion—although I might add that there is a big doubt in my mind as to whether that item will materialize as a savings.

The next two items cancel out, because postal operations add \$100 million and then there is an item designated "other"—I have no idea what the "other" means except that it involves projected expenditures of \$1.5 billion next year—supposedly representing savings of \$100 million there. But when these tabulations are considered there is a \$195 billion ceiling on the bill now before us.

Then we take the amendment of the Senator from Maine that has just been agreed to, and we find both ends of the barn open and the roof off. The American people should know we have no ceiling whatsoever, so why try to kid them. Let me read it.

This says:

That whenever action, or inaction by the Congress on requests for appropriations and

other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

That means the flexible ceiling will be raised automatically to cover any expenditure increase which this Congress may approve. In addition, under the Muskie amendment the ceiling automatically rises by the inaction of Congress on a recommendation of the President asking for new revenues.

Now, what are some of the proposals the President has made? He suggested that we raise postage rates effective July 1 of this year, which will bring in \$519 million additional revenue. I have as yet to see any bills on the floor of the Senate to raise those rates, and every Senator knows they are not going to be raised, at least effective July 1. That automatically—and I emphasize again the word automatically—adds \$519 million to this flexible ceiling. So we are back to a \$195.5 billion ceiling.

Now, it is true that when you move over to the amendment exempting Southeast Asia costs in section 2 of the committee's bill, the budget projection on page 27 indicates there will be a \$3.4 billion reduction on that item, and if that reduction materializes it will reduce the ceiling correspondingly. But even then we will have the figure of \$192.1 billion as a ceiling.

Then there are other exemptions added here today. The Senate has exempted HEW, or a good substantial part of HEW. I have no idea exactly what that extra exemption means; however, I understand that this one action is well in excess of \$1 billion.

Congress has exempted the impacted areas, which adds another \$200 million.

We have been unable to get any estimate on section 2 of the committee bill as to what the net increase would be, but I understand it is in excess of a billion dollars.

Under any circumstances, we have a ceiling of approximately \$195 billion. Under the committee proposal there will be a higher spending ceiling than even President Johnson proposed, and he was no piker when it came to talking about spending the taxpayers' money.

I certainly will not be a party to approving any such farce.

I think we need expenditure control; however, it is certain that no expenditure control is involved here.

I refer to another item in President Johnson's budget—and that is all this bill relates to, President Johnson's budget, not the Nixon budget—the President recommended an increase of social security taxes of \$1.6 billion next year.

I have as yet to hear anyone come up and say, "I am recommending or introducing a bill to raise the social security taxes." By our inaction or failure to act on the President's request it automatically adds another \$1.6 billion to the budget.

Then there is a budget proposal to add a user's tax on the airwaves—\$400 million. That has been suggested by both

Presidents, and I have as yet to hear any enthusiasm in that direction. There is \$400 million involved in that proposal, and unless Congress acts this represents another budget change.

When we get through, a \$200 billion spending level is permissible under the pending bill without any further action by Congress, and we never have to change the ceiling.

I have discussed this with the officials of the Bureau of the Budget, and this is their interpretation. I have said, "I want no misunderstanding of your interpretation if this bill is passed as it is reported by the Senate or by the House."

We have a situation now in which the House bill and the Senate version are the same on these automatic escalations. So the language will not be in conference. Therefore this interpretation will stand regardless of what the conferees may wish or not wish to do.

The Muskie amendment was the language of the House amendment.

The committee bill is in fact a floating ceiling. It floats up as Congress sees fit to increase spending. I would say that this version of a so-called spending ceiling is a spendthrift's dream. I certainly want no part of it. It serves but one purpose, and that is to fool the taxpayers.

I shall vote against it. I hope that at some later date Congress will recognize what it has done and that an opportunity will be afforded to correct today's action. Certainly we have no spending controls here, at least so far as I can see. I say that as one who has worked as much in this area as some of the rest.

These interpretations are not just mine but are also the point of view of the committee and the Director of the Budget.

My only suggestion is that if the Senate insists on approving the committee's recommendation it add one more amendment. That is an amendment which would be equally popular. Why not say in that amendment that the Senate loves mothers and all of the little children. People like that, and it would be as effective as what the Senate is doing here.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have a great deal of admiration for the Senator from Delaware. I admire his courage and tenacity. I admire his knowledge in this and other fields. I admire him as a very honorable opponent in this contest in which we have been engaged for the last 2 or 3 days. However, the Senator used the word "farce."

I do not think any Senator who supports the committee provision thinks he is engaging in a farce or that he is perpetrating anything on the Members of the Senate or that he is trying to fool the American people.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not say that the Senator is intentionally promoting a farce. I expressed my high opinion of the Senator yesterday. I only refer to the committee proposal as it is now before us. Perhaps "farce" is a harsh word. Perhaps it would be better just to say it is not worth the paper it is written on.

The fact remains that this has no effect whatsoever, I do not care what language is used.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator has every right

to place whatever interpretation he wishes on what the committee has done.

I just want to say in closing before we vote on the amendment that what the Senator from Delaware really wants is a deeper slash, and that is all right. I do not criticize him for that. He also wants to exempt fewer activities from the cuts, and I do not criticize him for that. But we went up this Hill and down on yesterday and the day before.

I simply want to say in summation that what the committee is doing here is recognizing that some items are unpredictable, such as the war in Southeast Asia, and that others are mandatory, fixed, or uncontrollable. I do not agree with the figures that the Senator has been using. The Senator has been using the figures from the budget document that came up here on January 15.

I am using the latest figures. Any Senator may call the Bureau of the Budget if he wishes and get the figures I have used. That is not too important at this point; however, except that those who read the RECORD must be put on notice that the figures the Senator is using are old figures and out of date.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the figures I used in my arguments are the figures referred to in the committee amendment. I quote the source. It is on page 71, lines 9 and 10—House document numbered 91-15, part I, 91st Congress.

The committee amendment refers to the budget of the United States. Here it is. I challenge the Senator from West Virginia to show anywhere in his committee amendment or in any other amendment attached thereto where it refers to any figures other than those in the budget of the United States. How accurate those figures are is beside the point.

Those are the figures to which the Senator's committee referred. Those are the figures I am quoting. Far be it from me to defend the accuracy of President Johnson's figures, but those are the ones to which the committee referred.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the bill does not refer to figures. It refers to items. The "items" that appear on page 71 of the bill identify the items, such as the war in Southeast Asia, interest on the national debt, mandatory civilian and military pay increases, price supports, Commodity Credit Corporation, veterans benefits.

It refers to the items but not to the figures. We said all of this yesterday and the day before.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not want to quarrel with the Senator from West Virginia whom I respect, but he is in error. To prove my point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the part on page 71 of the bill from line 1 through line 12. It speaks for itself.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Provided, That such amount shall be increased or decreased by the aggregate amount by which the sum of expenditures and net

lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser than the sum of expenditures and net lending in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for—

(1) items designated "Open-ended programs and fixed costs" in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-first Congress);

(2) the item designated "Special Southeast Asia support" in the table appearing on page 27 of that budget;

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The figures I quoted are taken from page 16 of that budget. If there are other figures I respectfully ask that the Senator from West Virginia incorporate them in the RECORD at this point. I cannot find them.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator has read into the RECORD the language which refers to the items designated at such and such a page in such and such a document. The language did not refer to figures therein and could not because the figures will change.

There still are several days in fiscal year 1969. We do not know exactly what the expenditures will finally be. I do not care what book is cited. All we are saying in this language is that the \$187.9 billion shall be exceeded by the amount by which the uncontrollable expenditures in fiscal year 1970 exceed the amount spent in fiscal year 1969. We state that we are exempting certain items, and we go to the budget document to find out what those items are. The Senator has read them: Support for Southeast Asia, interest on the national debt, social security, and so on. Those are the items. But the figures in that book were sent up here on January 15. The figures I have here came from the Bureau of the Budget on May 20, and yet even these latest figures are subject to change.

Why try to tell the people that the figures in that document of January 15 are the final figures? I do not say that about these May 20 figures, but these do bring us to a closer estimate of the overall situation as it today stands.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator will not dispute the fact that regardless of what the final figure may be when 1969 ends, to the extent that fiscal 1970 exceeds them the projection referred to is an automatic increase. The Budget Director's office said that is the way they are going to interpret the committee amendment.

I respect the Senator from West Virginia, but I disagree with him on this point. I am ready to vote, but I shall vote against the amendment. As I stated earlier, I will not use the word "farce"; I will not say it is not worth the paper it is written on; but I have been in a barn without a roof and never got as wet as the American people are going to get soaked under this bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, regardless of what happens in the category of the uncontrollables, we cannot control here today what is going to happen to the interest on the national debt. We will have to pay it. We do not appropriate it every year. It already has been appropriated. We cannot, by our action on an appropriation bill, reduce the amounts for social security. They already have been appropriated. We cannot

not reduce, by our actions on appropriations, the amounts to which we have already committed ourselves for price support programs. We might change it a year from now through legislation, but we cannot change the price supports expenditure through appropriations. These are then uncontrollables.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I will not yield at this time, but I will be glad to yield later.

These are areas in which we really have no control unless we change the basic laws. We have to appropriate whatever we are committed to appropriate. But there are other areas which are controllable and in which we can execute reductions.

We are not putting anything over on anybody, and nobody will get wet because of the holes in the roof of the barn that has both doors open. The committee is simply saying that, so far as the controllables are concerned, Congress and/or the administration must make not less than a \$1.9 billion reduction under the President's estimates in fiscal year 1970.

It is written in here to that effect, and it is as plain as the nose on the Senator's face. I shall read it:

Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1.9 billion.

Now, that is in the controllables. Who would expect us to reduce the expenditures in the uncontrollables? All we can do is reduce the expenditures in the controllables. If the Senator wants to force Congress or the President to reduce those controllable expenditures by an additional \$5 or \$10 billion, let him offer his amendment, and we will vote on it. But that is all we can do. That is all God's angel's can expect us to do—to cut or to raise the expenditures in those items which are controllable and which annually come before Congress for its decision. Parenthetically, may I say that of the \$210 billion in the 1970, only \$143.8 billion will be within reach of, and subject to, congressional action.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall not delay this vote. We have debated this amendment for 2 days.

The Senator spoke of noncontrollable expenditures, and then he mentioned price support programs. These are controllable expenditures. It is expected that next week a bill will be before the Senate—the House already has acted on it—to limit to \$20,000 the payments to any one farmer under the agriculture program. If the Senate sustains the House action it will make a difference of approximately \$200 million in the cost of administering the program, and half of this savings will be into the next fiscal year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is what we are talking about.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There are other controllable items which have been exempted under the committee bill. Why exempt the legislative branch? Why exempt the judiciary? These are items which can be controlled, and in my opinion we will have to control them

if we really are going to bring expenditures down to the level where we can afford them. I would dislike to see a tax bill go through Congress unless we can assure the taxpayers at the same time that this Congress is not going to use all that additional revenue just to expand the spending programs.

I recognize the difference between the opinions of the Senator from West Virginia and myself, but that is my interpretation of this committee bill; and so far as I am concerned I am ready to vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table of budget outlays estimated as of May 20, which was secured from the Bureau of the Budget. This is the table of statistics from which I have been quoting while the Senator from Delaware has been resorting to the figures used in the January 15 budget document.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET OUTLAYS (ESTIMATED)

[In billions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1970 change
Grand total.....	185.6	192.9	+7.3
Uncontrollables and special support of Southeast Asia.....	-103.6	-106.7	+3.1
Special support of Southeast Asia.....	(29.2)	(25.2)	(-4.0)
Open-ended programs and fixed costs:			
Social security, medicare, and other social insurance under existing law.....	(39.3)	(42.1)	(+2.7)
Interest.....	(15.6)	(16.4)	(+.8)
Civilian and military pay increase.....	(2.8)	(2.8)	(+2.8)
Veterans' pensions, compensation, and insurance.....	(5.7)	(6.1)	(+.3)
Public assistance grants (including medicaid).....	(6.3)	(7.2)	(+.9)
Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation).....	(4.3)	(3.6)	(-.8)
Postal operations directly related to mail volume.....	(.5)	(.5)	
Legislative and judiciary.....	(.4)	(.4)	
Other.....	(1.9)	(2.1)	(+.2)
Federal aid to schools in impacted areas.....	(.4)	(.4)	
Remainder after deducting above uncontrollables and special support of Southeast Asia.....	82.0	86.2	+4.2
Included in remainder:			
Department of Defense.....	(49.0)	(52.5)	(+3.5)
Other.....	(33.0)	(33.7)	(+.7)
Included in remainder figures: Prior-year contracts and obligations.....	(17.6)	(18.9)	(+1.3)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I will not detain the Senate more than a few minutes. I have been a member of this committee for some time, and I do not feel that I can permit the exchange that has occurred to go by without making some remarks.

I have a great deal of respect for the distinguished Senator from Delaware. At this time I say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that he has handled this bill with the greatest of thoroughness—probably the greatest thoroughness and capability of anyone whom I have ever seen handle it—and I pay my respects and my compliments to him for what he has done.

However, I must say—and this is the reason why I speak at this time—that I think he is in error in his interpretation of the bill—or at least of lines 1 to 10 on page 71 of the bill—and I think that in that respect the Senator from Delaware is entirely correct.

The key words are those that occur on line 4, and those are the figures—the sum of expenditures. The sum of expenditures, when coupled with the words in the following paragraph, subparagraph 1, referring particularly to House document numbered 91-15, part 1, 91st Congress, in my opinion, do exactly what the Senator from Delaware has said. I think that the Senator from West Virginia, on further reflection, might believe that his restriction of his interpretation, that it refers only to items, is too strict an interpretation and one which he would not want to follow. However, I believe every one of us understands what the nature of this is.

The real question is going to be whether this Senate and this Congress

in subsequent bills reflects and adheres to some kind of disciplinary program of restraint in spending. This is the key to the entire situation.

There are a few of us here, particularly those who serve on the Committee on Finance—I am not on the Committee on Finance but I serve on the Committee on Appropriations—who know the problems we face. I might add that I am very concerned and I intend to speak at some length on the floor of the Senate about the extent to which the Federal Government is earmarking itself to death. I shall expand on that thought to some extent later.

We now have a situation where actually defense appropriations are eliminated. Under the circumstances most of them at least are not controllable in my mind. Technically they are controllable, but under the situation in which we find ourselves today as realists they are not controllable except within narrow limits. If those items are included as uncontrollable, which they are for the most part, then today Congress is left really with control of only \$20 billion out of a total budget of something like \$191.9 billion.

In my own previous statements, I have been very generous, and I have said we had as much as \$30 billion of controllable items. If one were to take the higher figure, it is shocking and alarming that this Congress has permitted itself to get into a box through trust funds, through commitments, and through contract authority. These are items I shall discuss later. Congress has gotten itself into a box really where we have control over only \$20 billion in the Federal budget.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Colorado for mentioning this very important item.

As a member of the Committee on Finance, and before that the Ways and Means Committee in the House of Representatives, this matter has worried me for a long time. What we are required to spend this year is not the result of decisions that are made this year or by this Congress. It is largely the result of the decisions that have been made during the last 25 years, accumulative in nature, with built-in programs, commitments to people, commitments to communities, to industries, and to foreign countries. The long-range effect of the votes that we cast for or against legislative proposals that set Government programs into motion are more far-reaching than we realize. We sometimes have heard talk of the many new programs started under the Johnson administration. That is true. But I predict we will not feel the effect of all of those programs for possibly 10 years.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator very much. Of course, he is entirely correct. I shall mention two or three of these matters, Mr. President.

I forget how much we have appropriated to date for the rent supplement program. I shall not mention a figure because it escapes my mind. However, the fact is that one must multiply that amount by 40 years in order to realize the impact it has on our budget.

In this particular bill, for example, we are making a commitment to IDA, the International Development Association, for \$160 million, which is only one part of three payments we will make, making a total of \$480 million, which is a half billion dollars. So we have already earmarked for future Congresses for next year and the 92d Congress that will come in after that, \$160 million, and they will have no choice but to pay.

The same thing is true in this bill. We have \$50 million in the bill for section 235 funds, and \$50 million for section 236 funds. But let us not fool ourselves a bit about this matter. For practical purposes it may be diminished somewhat. What we are committing ourselves for on this part of the section 235 funds is as follows. They have already had \$25 million, so that makes \$75 million for this fiscal year on each of the section 235 and section 236 funds. That is a total of \$150 million for this year.

Let us not deceive ourselves. What we are committing ourselves to by doing so is that by giving them the contract authority we are committing ourselves to that sum of \$150 million for 40 years in the future, which may be diminished slightly as the incomes of some people rise and perhaps they do not take full advantage of it.

Mr. President, we are painting ourselves into the corner. If any man ever painted himself into the corner, this Congress is painting itself into the corner and past Congresses have painted themselves into a financial corner from which it will be very difficult to remove ourselves. The taxpayers' revolt which we hear about, read about, and get letters from our constituents about, and about

which they talk to us, arises from exactly such things as this.

I do support the amendment of the committee because I believe that the provisions on line 24, and subsequent lines, adequately protect us; and they will have a good go at it in conference also.

I thought this was an appropriate place to say I do agree with the interpretation of the Senator from Delaware, and also to call attention of the Senate to this matter because there has been some disposition on the floor of the Senate, as we have seen today, to go back to the old spending habits and then realize that we only have \$20 billion left in controllable items that this Congress can act on each year. We had better watch the barnyard door if we expect to have a barn in which to keep the horses in the future.

AMENDMENT NO. 42

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 42 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The proposed section 401 of the bill is amended by striking out "and" in line 13, page 71 and by striking the period at the end of line 16, page 71 and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, the word "and," and the following new subsection:

"(4) the item designated 'Veterans benefits and services' in the table appearing on page 69 of the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-first Congress)."

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the exemptions for the Veterans' Administration programs from the proposed limitation on fiscal year 1970 outlays would only include veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance.

This would not include the billion dollar medical and hospital program and the essential services directly required for the administration of all the veterans programs.

Accordingly, I propose an amendment which will clearly exempt all veterans benefits and services.

This amendment is entirely consistent with the Senate's agreement to the conferees' report to accompany the bill which became the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. At that time, the language regarding veterans programs was expanded by the conferees to attain the result proposed in the accompanying amendment in order to make certain that the veterans medical program and necessary services would not be jeopardized by an inflexible limitation on budgetary outlays.

Mr. President, the Vietnam war produces approximately 75,000 new veterans

each month. The Congress has passed legislation offering a wide range of well-deserved benefits to the veterans. Demands on every major program of the Veterans' Administration are greatly increased over last year. In the medical program alone during the first 9 months of 1969, more than 14,000 more veterans were admitted to VA hospitals than during the same period in 1968—and yet—Mr. President, under the personnel formula in the Revenue and Expenditures Control Act of 1968, the VA was forced to operate its hospital system with 5,000 fewer employees than they had in 1968—which, mind you, was the same number of employees which they were operating with on June 30, 1966.

The other workload increases in the Veterans' Administration comparing the first 9 months of fiscal years 1968 and 1969 are:

Outpatient visits, up 286,679.
Dental exams, up 22,043.
Dental treatments, up 15,500.
New prosthetic appliances, up 22,844.
Social work caseloads, up 6,999.
Mental hygiene clinic cases, up 3,905.
Clinical laboratory weighted work units, up 5,197,661.
Prescriptions filled, up 1,003,013.
Compensation and pension claims, up 226,113.
Education applications and authorizations, up 445,455.
Education counseling actions, up 22,547.
Loan guarantee appraisal requests, up 18,336.
Guardianship beneficiaries, up 61,357.
Contact personal interviews, up 112,992.
Contact telephone interviews, up 1,787,097.
Incoming mail, up 4,209,047.

Senators should not forget, Mr. President, that the casualties of the Vietnam war are being treated promptly in Veterans' Administration hospitals without the necessity of building a single new hospital. These new patients have been absorbed in the general workload of the Veterans' Administration and we are all happy and proud of that fact, but we cannot permit this agency in the middle of a war to suffer a cut that will impair its operations.

Mr. President, there is another factor which has increased the workload in the Veterans' Administration.

When the servicemen came home from World War II they sat around in barracks for a week, and had plenty of time to be counseled. Today, when they come back from Europe, Korea, or Vietnam, they are right out of the service. Now the VA goes to Vietnam.

The Veterans' Administration maintains a staff of 10 contact representatives at seven locations in Vietnam. As of April 30, 1969, a total of 718,164 soon to be discharged GI's had been oriented on their potential GI benefits. Since the inception of this program more than 77,000 personal interviews have been conducted and almost 30,000 actual applications for benefits have been filed by GI's before departure from Vietnam. VA representatives assigned to duty in Viet-

nam are all volunteers and their tours are for 6 months' duration. Two VA contact representatives have been killed in Vietnam while carrying out their responsibilities.

The VA is conducting a comprehensive bedside assistance program while wounded GI's are still hospitalized in 115 military hospitals. During fiscal year 1968 more than 7,000 visits were made to military hospitals and personal interviews were conducted with 61,867 disabled servicemen. Vocational rehabilitation applications totaled 20,269 and claims for compensation approximated 25,000.

Preseparation group orientation on benefits is provided at 288 military separation points each month. During fiscal year 1968 almost 8,000 visits were made to these separation points by VA contact representatives, over 496,000 servicemen were oriented, and 70,265 personal interviews were conducted.

Certainly, Mr. President, our brave young veterans are entitled to the full range of benefits already granted by the Congress—and they must receive proper service for their future needs. I for one, Mr. President, intend to see that this solemn commitment is fulfilled because there has been no ceiling on death or injury in Vietnam and I do not believe the people of this Nation want the Congress to place a ceiling on the compassion our country has for its veterans, and the agency which must look after these men.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD various telegrams on the subject received from national commanders of veterans organizations.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 16, 1969.

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States wholeheartedly supports your effort to insure that veterans benefits and services will not be curtailed at a time when casualties in Vietnam and the return of 75,000 veterans to civilian life each month imposes increasing burdens on the Veterans Administration. We have urged your colleagues in the Senate to support amendment of the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969 (H.R. 11400), to add veterans services to exemptions, including veterans benefits, already approved by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

We appreciate your strong support of the Nation's commitment to its veterans.

RICHARD HOMAN,
National Commander, Veterans of
Foreign Wars.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 16, 1969.

HON. HERMAN TALMADGE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Disabled American Veterans commends you for your efforts in behalf of the Nation's veterans and strongly supports your amendments to exempt veterans benefits and services from the spending ceiling proposed by H.R. 11400.

WAYNE L. SHERIBON,
National Commander, Disabled American
Veterans.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 16, 1969.

Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The veterans of World War One are deeply concerned over certain provisions of H.R. 11400 as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Payments of pensions, compensations and insurance are excluded from proposed limitations on fiscal year 1970 outlays. However, the billion dollar medical-hospital program which treats almost 800,000 sick and disabled veterans each year and other essential services for benefits already voted by the Congress are not exempt from the proposed bill.

The total veteran population has soared over 27,000,000 veterans this year and with 75,000 new veterans being added to the rolls each month from the Vietnam war unprecedented demands are being made on VA facilities. There are alarming backlogs of cases at practically all VA regional offices and over 14,000 more veterans were admitted to VA hospitals in the first nine months of fiscal year 1969 than during the same period in fiscal 1968.

The Veterans of World War One strongly favor the amendment which you plan to offer to H.R. 11400 exempting all veterans benefits from the ceiling which is proposed by the bill.

VICTOR V. MILLER,
National Commander, Veterans of World
War I, U.S.A. Inc.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 16, 1969.

Hon. HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The American Legion strongly supports your amendment to H.R. 11400 to remove VA from spending and personnel ceilings on budget expenditure for fiscal year 1970 so that the veterans programs will not be further jeopardized.

Approval of your amendment will assure that VA will be able to carry out its mission to war veterans and their dependents.

Between 70,000 and 80,000 new veterans, many of them disabled, are returning to civilian life each month from the Vietnam war. This, together with increasing workloads in benefits and services to all war veterans is severely impairing VA's ability to effectively administer its programs. The cost of war and veterans benefits—a delayed cost of war—are essential obligations of our Government, and on behalf of the American Legion I thank you for your effort to preserve these programs.

WILLIAM C. DOYLE,
National Commander, the American
Legion.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
June 16, 1969.

Senator HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

H.R. 11400 as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations will severely hamper the future operations of the Veterans Administration hospital program which treats approximately 800,000 sick and disabled veterans each year. H.R. 11400 as reported by the committee exempts benefit payments to veterans and their dependents for pensions, compensation and insurance, but does not exempt hospital and other operations essential to serving our Nation's veterans. There are critical backlogs of cases at most Veterans Administration regional offices brought about by the discharge of 75,000 new veterans each month from the Vietnam war. The Veterans Administration cannot be expected to handle this soaring new workload at 1966 funding and personnel levels. AMVETS strongly support the

amendment you plan to offer which would exempt all veterans benefits and services from the ceiling proposed in the bill.

JOSEPH V. FERRINO,
National Commander, AMVETS.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for offering the amendment which really carries out the full intent of the committee. I think that possibly it was an oversight that we did not exempt all of the programs which were exempted last year under the Veterans' Administration. That certainly was the intent of the committee, and the Senator from Georgia is rendering a valuable service in offering his amendment. I thank him for calling the error to my attention.

I feel sure that the amendment should and will be adopted and, therefore, Mr. MUNDT and I are willing to accept it, because, as I said before, it merely fulfills and rounds out the exact intent of the committee when it placed the veterans programs in the exempt category of uncontrollable items under the bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his generous remarks and the others members of the subcommittee for accepting this amendment. I felt certain that neither members of the Appropriations Committee nor the Senate meant to cut back on hospital services and benefits for our wounded veterans returning from Vietnam at this time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct. What the Senator's amendment would do would be to assure that this act will exempt exactly what was exempted last year, with respect to those items under the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, let me say to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I am very happy to be in some of the veterans organizations, who have called the attention of the subcommittee to this matter; but it was a misinterpretation on our part because we thought we had done precisely what the Senator's amendment will now accomplish. We intended to do that. We had buttoned it down firmly and strongly. I assure the Senator from Georgia that the subcommittee will fight the valiant battle in conference to be sure it will still be in the bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished acting minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia discussed this with the able Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) and with me, and we agreed that we would accept it. We are happy to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 42) of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, beginning on page 70 of the bill.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 9, as follows:

[No. 39 Leg.]
YEAS—80

Aiken	Gore	Montoya
Allen	Gravel	Mundt
Ailott	Griffin	Murphy
Baker	Harris	Muskie
Bellmon	Hart	Nelson
Bible	Hartke	Pastore
Boggs	Hatfield	Pearson
Brooke	Holland	Pell
Burdick	Hollings	Percy
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hughes	Proxmire
Cannon	Inouye	Randolph
Case	Jackson	Ribicoff
Church	Javits	Schweiker
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	Smith
Dodd	Kennedy	Spong
Dole	Long	Stennis
Dominick	Magnuson	Stevens
Eagleton	Mansfield	Symington
Eastland	Mathias	Talmadge
Ellender	McCarthy	Tower
Ervin	McClellan	Tydings
Fannin	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Goldwater	Miller	Young, Ohio
Goode	Mondale	

NAYS—9

Bennett	Curtis	Packwood
Cook	Gurney	Thurmond
Cooper	Hansen	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	McGee	Saxbe
Bayh	McIntyre	Sparkman
Cranston	Moss	Yarborough
Fulbright	Russell	

So the committee amendment, as amended, beginning on page 70 of the bill, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the last committee amendment that was not agreed to.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 73, after line 5, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 503. Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-364, approved June 28, 1968), is hereby repealed."

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there will be some controversy on the proposal embodied in the pending committee amendment, and I should like at this time to ask, with the approval of the manager of the bill and the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), that there be a time limitation on the amendment of 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the two Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to that. All I want is a rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my further understanding that immediately upon conclusion of the vote on the pending proposal, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) will obtain the floor to deliver a speech of approximately 30 minutes.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that, when the pending matter is disposed of, the amendment to be offered by the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be laid before the Senate and made the pending business for tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I shall attempt to be brief.

This amendment by the committee would repeal section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of last year—Public Law 90-364.

What did that section do? It said that only three out of every four vacancies occurring in the executive branch could be filled, until such time as the overall level of Federal employees was equal to the level of June 30, 1963. It also required that that June 30, 1966, level had to be maintained, once it was reached.

In the testimony before our subcommittee, it was stated by Mr. Mayo and by various department heads and agency representatives that this section 201 had worked a great hardship upon the agencies, that it had been overly stringent, and that in some instances it had caused the agencies to have to expend more money to do the same amount of work than they would have had to expend otherwise. In other words, it ended up costing the Government money in some instances rather than saving money.

For example, the Bureau of Customs was unable to examine all mailed pack-

ages, and, as a consequence, it was estimated that the loss in revenue was between \$30 million and \$40 million.

The Social Security Administration, because it could not fill all of the vacancies that it needed to fill, had to resort to much overtime, and the result was that the agency spent \$6 million more in overtime than it would have had to spend to do the same amount of work on a regular worktime basis.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue, it was indicated, had lost an estimated \$500 million in revenue because of the fact that it was restricted by this section from filling needed positions; and it was also estimated that if the section remains unrepealed, the Bureau of Internal Revenue may lose up to \$1 billion in revenues in the forthcoming fiscal year.

Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy has noted that he is faced with the problem of "having professional and upper grade personnel do their own clerical work and typing because of vacancies not being filled at the clerical levels." He has "also had to resort to the costly practice of overtime and use of intermittent—casual—employees, since these are exempt from the ceiling."

Secretary of Transportation Volpe has said that aging facilities of the St. Lawrence Seaway have been maintained only through the use of increased overtime. Furthermore, it has been reported that a number of agencies, contrary to official policy, are resorting to expensive contracting-out of jobs that should ordinarily be done in-house. Moreover, there have been complaints from Federal employee unions that in some installations military personnel are being substituted for civilian personnel in the Department of Defense.

In summation, then, everyone recognizes the validity of the desire to reduce the number of Federal employees. So there is no criticism of the idea behind section 201, but all too often it simply has proved to be unworkable and self-defeating; it has proved to be overly restrictive on some agencies; it has been too rigid, and it has brought about an inefficient utilization of employees; and it has in some instances resulted in higher costs rather than savings, as I have already pointed out; and so both Presidents, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Nixon, have expressed their opposition to it.

The 1970 estimates as submitted by President Nixon and by President Johnson have in both instances assumed the repeal of section 201 of 90-364, and have assumed its repeal at the beginning of fiscal year 1970, the new year.

The House just within the waning days of last month passed two appropriation bills, one making appropriations for the Departments of Post Office and Treasury, and the other making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture. In both of those bills, the other body repealed section 201 for those departments only, and for 1 year only. So, what we are doing here in the bill before the Senate is repealing section 201 permanently and all the way across the board.

I must say that I think Congress accomplished some good in having this section in the law for 1 year.

Some good has resulted. The employment limitations have compelled the closing of a number of marginal installations which should have been closed out sometime ago. An arbitrary limitation enacted by the Congress has been used as the lever to offset the political pressures—sometimes emanating from the Congress itself—which have often forced the continuation of marginal activities.

As bad as it is, the law has also provided some good managers with the incentive to come up with ingenious approaches and new ideas. Moreover, in the past, dollar limitations—due to changing circumstances—have not always prevented agencies from hiring more employees than would be consistent with efficient management oversight. Much hiring can take place near the end of the fiscal year to boost employment levels for the start of the next fiscal year. This higher employment can then be used to justify more dollars since the yearend level of employment must be "annualized." Therefore, some type of personnel constraint, in addition to the dollar constraints, may well be desirable. However, it should relate to agency programs and priorities, and should not be determined by an arbitrary formula.

The President in this administration has already gone on record as saying that he intends to cut Federal employment as much as is advisable and feasible and economical, and that he does not want this restriction in the law which is unduly stringent upon some agencies, more so than upon others. I think we should give him a chance to make good on his promise.

The present administration, I am told in testimony before the committee and otherwise, has cut the number of Federal employees from the figure envisioned in the Johnson budget by approximately 48,000.

The Johnson budget would have increased the number of Federal employees by 43,000, it has been said, whereas the Nixon administration states it is going to cut that figure out entirely and further reduce employment by 5,000. That makes a total of 48,000 fewer employees than the Federal Government would have had under the Johnson budget, so the testimony states. In other words, the 2,650,000 figure as of June 30 for full time permanent employees will be dropped to 2,645,000.

The Nixon administration says it is going to follow through with the employees reductions Congress wants, but that it does not want to be strait-jacketed by section 201.

I urge that the Senate affirm the committee action and repeal section 201 so that we do not have to do it piecemeal in every appropriation bill that comes before the Senate, as the House is already endeavoring to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I need.

Last year Congress passed the law the purpose of which was to allow the Government to replace but three out of every four retirees. It gave the Director of the

Bureau of the Budget the authority to make those cuts in any agency which he thought would least disrupt service to the people.

One department could be given increased employees while the cuts were being made in less essential services, or the reduction could come from some over-staffed agency.

The approval of the language of that bill had been agreed upon by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Budget.

The bill was passed. The fact that it has served as some handicap to various departments in itself is commendable because they need a little handicap. Our civilian employment had exceeded the three million figure. If we now repeal this measure we might as well recognize that the Senate is approving another merry-go-round of increased Government personnel.

I was interested in but not at all amused by the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Kennedy, when he claimed the Treasury lost \$500 million as a result of this law and would lose \$1 billion next year unless it were repealed.

I said to him:

I suppose then we can reduce the budget by \$1.5 billion if we repeal this law and then you can pick up the extra revenue.

He said:

Well, that was just a guess.

It is the same kind of a guess and the same kind of irresponsible statement—and I emphasize the word irresponsible—as when he said that if we do not pass the surtax there would be price and wage controls.

Both statements were made at a time when he should have been thinking rather than speaking.

But for the moment let us assume that the Secretary was serious in saying that he needed these employees to collect the taxes and serve the people in the Customs Service. Then why did they add 2,745 employees in the Agriculture Department last month instead of hiring more revenue agents?

We already have as many employees in the Agriculture Department as we have farmers. After all, they are spending, not collecting money.

The Interior Department last month added 1,418 employees.

If they needed the employees in the Treasury Department why were they not added there? But they put the 1,400 extra employees in the Interior Department.

In the Post Office Department 2,324 were added, and 707 employees were added in the civilian department of the Army.

Why, if they needed them in the Treasury Department, did they not add them there? Or better yet, why did they not put to work some of the employees they already had?

The Treasury Department has several hundred employees selling E bonds to the workmen at 4¼ percent interest which, in my opinion, is immoral at a time when the Government itself is paying 6.5 percent interest to anyone who has \$1,000 to invest. But did they cut back employees in that depart-

ment? Not at all. They add employees in every category but where they say they need them. They always come back and threaten a loss of service if anyone dares suggest that the operation could be more efficient.

That goes for this administration as well as for the other administration. President Johnson promised he would cut the number of employees without any urging from Congress. In fact, the bill which I had passed was President Johnson's Executive order which he issued but then promptly ignored.

President Johnson said when he issued that Executive order that he had more employees on the payroll than were needed. He criticized the padding of the public payrolls at the taxpayers' expense and said that he was issuing that Executive order to cut the number of employees back to the 1966 level. Instead he added an additional 40,000 employees. I suppose those employees were considered necessary to find out whom he could lay off.

Every time anyone talks about cutting the number of employees we find that they have put on more until this restriction was placed in the law. Certainly it has pinched. I would like to see it pinch them a little more.

The issue is very clear here today. Do we really want to reduce the level of Federal employment? That goes for Congress as well as the executive branch. Just this afternoon the Senate had to clear the Senate Chamber in order to hear what was going on because some of the surplus employees in the Senate offices were here loafing, and we could not even find a way for Senators to get to their seats.

Let us put the employees we have to work during the hours they are on the job. If they stop loafing during the day they will not have to work all of this overtime.

Let us reject the committee amendment, and let us keep the heat on.

I call attention to the fact that under the 1970 budget the Agriculture Department wants another 3,400 employees.

I do not know what they are doing with all of these employees in the Agriculture Department unless they plan to put on the public payroll all of the little farmers that they are trying to break with some of their absurd programs.

The 1970 budget requests are for 46,000 employees. How many of these 46,000 were to be added in the Treasury Department? About 10 percent, and all of the rest of them were to be added to the spending agencies. They would be spending twice as fast as the 7,000 employees than the Treasury Department could collect it.

I repeat, the Director of the Budget has the authority under the existing law to allocate the cuts in any area he wishes, and to assign employees in an area where they are most needed.

Both President Johnson and President Nixon have said that there is an over-staffing in many of these agencies. Let us start rolling them back.

It has been admitted that since the present law has been in effect Federal employment has been reduced by at least 60,000 employees.

The involves an annual saving of \$600 million, and that is no guess. It costs at a minimum about \$10,000 annually for every employee put on.

I hope the amendment is rejected and the present law is retained.

I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that I am glad he has presented this issue. It is clear cut here—repeal the law in its entirety or make up our minds that we will keep it.

This is the time for the Senate to stand up and be counted.

Let us cut out this piecemeal job. Earlier this afternoon the Senate removed any ceiling on spending. The least it can do is to keep a ceiling on the number of employees.

So far as I am concerned I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time. Let us vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a moment ago, I referred to the appropriation bill passed by the House as the Post Office and Civil Service appropriation bill. What I mean to say was the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator from Delaware is entitled to know this: In the Agriculture Department, that increase of employees has to do with the nutritional aides that are being employed to try to help give a better level of information as to what is sound nutrition to the poor people who are being served by that department. I see no way we can avoid that.

So far as the Agriculture Subcommittee is concerned, speaking as one member, I do not see how we can do that job without repealing the effect of this law as to the Agriculture Department.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). All time on the committee amendment is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 73, lines 6, 7, and 8. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

BAYH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 40 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alken	Harris	Muskie
Allott	Hart	Nelson
Baker	Holland	Pastore
Bennett	Hollings	Pell
Bible	Hruska	Percy
Boggs	Hughes	Prouty
Burdick	Inouye	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Ribicoff
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Schweiker
Case	Kennedy	Scott
Church	Long	Smith
Dirksen	Magnuson	Spong
Dodd	Mathias	Stennis
Eagleton	McClellan	Stevens
Ervin	McGovern	Symington
Fong	Metcalfe	Talmadge
Goodell	Mondale	Tower
Gore	Montoya	Tydings
Gravel	Mundt	Williams, N.J.
Griffin	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—25

Allen	Dominick	Miller
Bellmon	Fannin	Packwood
Brooke	Gurney	Pearson
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Proxmire
Cook	Hartke	Thurmond
Cooper	Hatfield	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Javits	Young, Ohio
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	
Dole	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Fulbright	Moss
Bayh	Goldwater	Russell
Cranston	McCarthy	Saxbe
Eastland	McGee	Sparkman
Ellender	McIntyre	Yarborough

So the committee amendment on page 73, lines 6, 7, and 8, was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 73, repealing section 201, was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), after which the Chair will recognize the Senator from South Carolina.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) proposes for himself and Mr. NELSON, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CASE, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. HART, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. MCCARTHY an amendment as follows:

On page 16, line 25, strike out the figure "\$7,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$55,000,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order this amendment (No. 40) becomes the pending business.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to title 4 of the pending bill and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment now pending.

Mr. BAKER. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendment which I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment will be laid aside and the clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), for himself, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) proposes a new paragraph at the end of title 4 as follows:

Expenditures by the Tennessee Valley Authority out of the proceeds from its power operations, from the sale of any power program assets, or from power revenue bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness shall not be subject to any limitations imposed by this title.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, this exemption would have nothing to do with appropriated funds. It has to do only with internally generated funds of the Tennessee Valley Authority which they earn.

This proposal was accepted by the Senate last year, and I understand it may be accepted by the manager of the bill this year.

The amendment would exempt from any limitation on Federal expenditures imposed by the pending bill the power operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. President, I wish to assure my colleagues that this amendment does not derive from any parochial interest on the part of the junior Senator from Tennessee to protect the Tennessee Valley Authority from being required to bear its fair and proportionate share of any expenditure reductions that may result from an expenditure limitation that I favor as an earnest commitment of the Congress to fiscal responsibility. As I hope to explain, the power operations of TVA are unique in their nature and in their funding. The Congress last year passed a virtually identical amendment to exempt TVA power operations from the provisions of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority undertakes two separate and distinct functions in the seven-State region that it serves. One of these two functions is essentially a conservation program, in which TVA plans and constructs flood control projects, creates reservoirs for municipal water supply, industrial use and recreation, promotes fish and wildlife populations, encourages enlightened agricultural and forestry practices, and so on. All of these activities are financed with funds appropriated annually by the Congress out of the general funds of the Treasury.

The second function of TVA is its function as sole supplier of power within those parts of the seven States of the region that it serves. Since 1959, the power operations of TVA have been wholly self-financed. Whereas the conservation activities of TVA are financed with annual appropriations, the power

activities of TVA are financed entirely out of revenues derived from the sale of power and from the issuance by TVA of revenue bonds and notes, bonds and notes which must be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury but which do not bear the full faith and credit of the Federal Government.

In addition to financing its own power operations, Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority makes annual payments into the Treasury of the United States out of its net power earnings. These annual payments are a repayment of the original investment of appropriated funds that was made prior to the 1959 amendment that authorized self-financing. TVA also makes an annual payment as a return or dividend on the outstanding appropriation investment. In 1968, TVA paid into the Treasury, out of its net power earnings, \$61.9 million, which represented a reduction by \$15 million of the original investment and a dividend payment of \$46.9 million.

The amendment that I have proposed would in no way exempt the conservation-related activities of TVA from the expenditure limitation. The revised budget request of the new administration for these nonpower operations is for an appropriation of \$49,750,000. These funds would not be affected by my amendment and would be subject to any reduction made necessary by the expenditure limitation.

What my amendment would exempt from the expenditure limitation is the TVA power program, which is wholly financed out of power proceeds and borrowings. TVA, during 1970, will be the sole supplier of an estimated 97.9 billion kilowatt hours to an area of 80,000 square miles. TVA generates power and transmits it to wholesale distributors who in turn sell the power to domestic and industrial users throughout the valley. TVA also supplies power directly to a few large industries and to several government agencies such as the Atomic Energy Commission—that require enormous amounts of electrical energy for their operations. The Board of Directors of TVA must anticipate the rapidly expanding power needs of the region and continue the construction of the new generation and transmission facilities that will be required to meet that need. In 1970 TVA will have under construction five nuclear generating units and three fossil-fueled units. Any artificial or arbitrary restriction of those projects would have the most serious consequences on the obligation of TVA to anticipate and to provide for the legitimate power needs of the region.

Mr. President, last year the Senate accepted an amendment to the Williams-Smathers substitute, which eventually became the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, an amendment identical in effect to the one I have introduced today. Unfortunately, that amendment was stricken in conference. However, the same amendment was later offered to the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1968 and was accepted by both Houses. It is now a part of Public Law 90-483.

Mr. President, any reduction in the power operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority would not result in any

saving to the Treasury or to the American taxpayer. Net power earnings would simply increase in the short-term and would accumulate in the treasury of TVA, not in the Treasury of the United States. The capacity of TVA to plan for and to provide the future power needs of the region, of which TVA is the sole supplier, would be seriously jeopardized.

Mr. President, I reiterate for the sake of emphasis that nothing in my amendment would affect the nonpower operations of TVA that are financed out of appropriated funds; these projects would as it were take their lumps along with those of every other Federal agency. My amendment would affect only those expenditures made out of other than appropriated funds, that is, out of power proceeds and borrowings by TVA that are not backed by the faith and credit of the Government. The principle justification for this amendment is not that TVA's power operations are vitally important to millions of Americans—which they are—but rather that these power operations pay their own way and are not financed through the appropriation and expenditure of general public funds.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this item was exempted last year by Congress. The Senator discussed the matter with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), who is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and with me. Mr. MUNDT and I have agreed to accept the amendment and to take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROGRESS ON WASHINGTON'S RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the pending supplemental appropriation bill contains \$18.7 million to begin construction on the long overdue Washington metropolitan area subway and rapid mass transit system. Appropriation of this money now, together with matching appropriations enacted in previous years, will make possible an immediate and substantial beginning of the subway system.

Last week the Senate and House Committees on the District of Columbia held extraordinary joint hearings to consider legislation which will provide the billion dollars of Federal money necessary to complete financing of the entire 97-mile Washington area transit system. This Federal assistance will match local government contributions and bonds financed from farebox revenues totaling more than \$1.4 billion.

The rail transit system these funds will create will be a model for the entire Nation, will provide essential transportation for Federal employees and provide

a vital link of the balanced transportation system Washington so desperately needs.

In order to expedite the progress of that legislation through Congress, I have scheduled an executive session of the Committee on the District of Columbia for 8 a.m., July 1, to consider and, hopefully, to report that billion-dollar Federal authorization. If we can meet the timetable I propose, the full Federal share of the subway rapid transit system costs can be authorized by the Senate well before the August recess. With comparable expedition by the House of Representatives, we may be able to secure enactment of this legislation by both Houses before the fall.

The \$18.7 million contained in this supplemental appropriation bill today, however, is the first step on the long journey to the completion of the subway system. That journey has been too long delayed by differences which must be compromised to create a balanced transportation system for Washington.

As I indicated last week during the hearings on the full Federal share of subway costs, if money is not appropriated this year to begin the subway system, the entire Washington metropolitan area rapid mass transit plan may collapse. Costs are rising at a rate of \$90 million a year. That is a quarter of a million dollars a day.

As Chairman Fred Babson, of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, testified at our hearings last week, if inflation requires recomputation of the suburban shares of the subway cost and an upward adjustment of the Federal cost, the delay of the rapid transit system in Washington will not be a matter of months or years, but perhaps even of decades.

That is why the money contained in the supplemental appropriation bill is vitally important to the future of the entire subway system.

In view of the transportation crisis facing the Washington metropolitan area, and in view of the fact that the \$18.7 million in this legislation is the keystone of a balanced answer to that crisis, it is fair to say that this supplemental appropriation bill may prove to be the most important legislation Congress will enact in this session, perhaps in this entire decade, for the Washington metropolitan area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now, the question recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), which is the pending business before the Senate.

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE DOUGLAS AND GAMBLING LINKS OF THE PARVIN FOUNDATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want to announce that I am going to make a speech against Supreme Court Justice Douglas, and if any Senator is interested in replying, I shall be glad to stay here as late as necessary and debate the question.

Mr. President, much attention has been directed toward the gambling interests held by the Albert Parvin

Foundation in the period during which Mr. Justice Douglas was president of the foundation, but there has yet been no systematic presentation of these interests. While gambling is a legitimate enterprise in Nevada, its past, and to a degree its present, is inseparable in the public mind with gangsterism and corruption. The history of most of the major casinos, including those associated with the Parvin Foundation's interests, has been intertwined with the worst elements in American society. Even in cases where such casinos have come under legitimate ownership and management, the public suspects, rightly or wrongly, that persons with criminal records are still involved in the operation. These public suspicions are confirmed by the statement of J. Edgar Hoover that Nevada's organized gambling "occupies a position of major importance in the scheme of organized crime and racketeering"—New York Times, November 26, 1966.

If a private investor wishes to expose himself to such suspicion for the sake of legal gaming profits, he has every right to do so. However, an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court can only bring the Court into disrepute by associating himself with the profits of such enterprise, and I again call for his resignation.

Mr. President, I intend to show here today that the Parvin Foundation profited handsomely from its gambling interests. The very basis of the funds which Justice Douglas was administering in the name of so-called charitable causes was deeply rooted in the gaming business, with all the associated activity that brings it in deep disrepute.

I will show here today that the Parvin Foundation's links to gambling went far beyond the mere holding of gambling stocks in its portfolio. Indeed, the two men who can be identified as responsible for the foundation's financial management, Albert Parvin and Harvey Silbert, were closely identified with the actual management of the Fremont Casino—Parvin as a casino owner, and Silbert as the father-in-law of another casino owner, whose record will be shown later in this address.

Parvin and Silbert also arranged a \$750,000 mortgage loan from the foundation for their company, Parvin/Dohrmann, at a time when money was tight. This loan has come under scrutiny by the Internal Revenue Service. It was the object of a stockholder's suit, which, if it had reached the Supreme Court, would have required Justice Douglas to disqualify himself.

In addition, Parvin and Silbert allowed Ed Levinson to become a \$100,000 employee of Parvin/Dohrmann, and to purchase 40,000 shares of P/D stock, with full knowledge that Levinson had been notified that he faced possible criminal charges for "skimming" operations at the Fremont Casino.

In addition, Parvin and his associates in P/D held private interests in at least five other Las Vegas casinos.

Finally, the Parvin Foundation recently quadrupled its investment in P/D stock by selling out at a high speculative price brought on by questionable manip-

tion of his own. On the other hand, P/D's loss last year was caused by a one-shot write-down of company assets, and the company has already reported a bullishly handsome profit of \$1.02 per share in the first quarter of 1969. There is the chance for a killing or a debacle, in order words, just as there is at one of the company's crap tables.

BUFFETED PARVIN/DOHRMANN PREPARES FOR A NEW GAME

If the merger proposed last week between Parvin/Dohrmann Co., the much-publicized owner of three Las Vegas hotel-casinos, and Denny's Restaurants, Inc., operator of 1,200 fast-food service outlets, goes through, the big winner will be P/D's wheeling and dealing chairman, Delbert W. Coleman.

An Akron-born lawyer, Coleman has been in the limelight because of the sky-rocketing performance of P/D stock, propelled by massive insider and institutional trading. Coleman holds 207,000 shares which he presumably would be free to sell sometime after mid-October, the earliest the P/D-Denny's deal can be consummated. Denny's is offering four of its shares for one of P/D's, which at the recent \$35 price for Denny's could bring Coleman a \$19-million profit. The proposal provides that Coleman will be neither an officer nor director in the merged corporation.

Others would share Coleman's fortune. When he agreed last Oct. 25 to buy 300,000 shares of P/D—25% of the company—from Harry A. Goldman, the concern's chairman, and Albert B. Parvin, president, at \$35 a share, Coleman also was acting for some associates. Included were a group of mutual funds and luminaries such as actress Jill St. John; Chicago lawyer Sidney R. Korshak; William C. Bartholomay, president of the Atlanta Braves baseball team; Allen & Co., the large New York investment house; Alfred Powis, president of Noranda Mines, a Canadian concern which years ago bought out a Coleman-controlled company; and Rubia M. White, wife of a vice-president of Toronto-Dominion Bank, which lent Coleman \$2.5-million to pay his 1968 income taxes.

Coleman's biggest partner was F. O. F. Proprietary Funds, Ltd., which was allotted 81,000 shares. But the fund was forced to sell its shares in a private placement this April when the Nevada Gaming Control Board objected to its ownership. It is part of the holdings of Bernard Cornfeld's Switzerland-based Investors Overseas Services, Ltd., empire which already held interests in Resorts International, a company with gambling interests in the Bahamas. The fund apparently sold its holdings for \$90 a share, thus becoming among the first to cash in handsomely on P/D's stock play.

UP AND AWAY

P/D's shares rose abruptly soon after Coleman signed the deal with Parvin and Goldman. By the time it was consummated on Jan. 13, the stock had soared to 68½. The shares kept climbing even after P/D reported a loss of \$2.49 a share for 1968. The loss was cushioned, however, with the announcement that the company earned a first-quarter profit of \$1.02 a share, and on May 13 the price moved to a high of 141½.

Shares declined sharply, but only temporarily, when the Nevada Gaming Control Board said it would issue no more casino licenses to P/D until the state scrutinized operations of its present three hotel-casinos—the Fremont, Stardust, and Aladdin. This apparently stalled P/D's contemplated purchase of the Riviera hotel-casino.

Authorities could have turned on a caution light for several reasons, among them the attention attracted to P/D by investigations of the Securities & Exchange Commission, the American Stock Exchange, and even the commissioner of baseball. Gaming officials probably were also upset that P/D would have been buying a 60% controlling

interest in the Riviera from a group that included three then P/D directors and one of its employees, Edward Torres. Torres now owns 63,000 P/D shares, manages its hotel operations, and is still a Riviera owner.

In mid-April, the American Stock Exchange halted trading in P/Ds shares, and trading started over the counter. On May 5 the SEC ordered a temporary halt to OTC activity in the stock. The ban was lifted May 12, but not before the company was forced to spell out details of Coleman's purchases and the names of his associates—something he had failed to do because of what he called "an oversight."

In addition to notoriety from its own actions, P/D was buffeted by related attacks on the Albert Parvin Foundation, set up by P/D's former president with revenues from P/D stock and from shares in other corporations with gambling interests. The foundation's only paid officer was Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who resigned the position last month.

NEW DAY

Parvin/Dohrmann currently is being run by 32-year-old William C. Scott, Jr., a "very close friend" of Coleman's. Scott predicts the company will turn out to be a classic turnaround situation.

Scott entered the scene last October when Coleman asked him to review the operations of the Los Angeles-based corporation consisting of Albert Parvin & Co., an interior design company; the Dohrmann Co., a 119-year-old hotel supply and equipment-making concern; and the Aladdin and Fremont hotels in Nevada. Before the month ended, Coleman agreed to buy into P/D.

Scott, now P/D's president, was then the youngest partner in the accounting firm of Arthur Anderson & Co. He says he found a company rich with promise and opportunity, but completely lacking in top management and financial controls. Only Parvin and Goldman were permitted to make decisions, yet Goldman had been sick all year, and Parvin had lost interest in the company.

As an indication of the bad state of affairs, Parvin predicted on Sept. 26 that the company would show a profit "three times 1967, maybe four times." This would have worked out to earnings of between \$1.50 and \$2 a share, instead of the loss actually shown.

OPPORTUNITY

Scott saw that the hotel-casinos were raking in money—he figures the Fremont for a year and the Aladdin for six months brought in \$1.80 a share—and more could be expected with improved controls and the addition of more hotels. However, the company's other operations were eating up the profits.

Since taking over on Jan. 10, Scott has done much to put things in shape, including tightening financial controls on the Aladdin and Fremont as well as the Stardust, which P/D purchased this year. For the first quarter Scott reported a profit of \$1.4-million or \$1.02 a share. With the 1,450-room Stardust and its popular Lido show in the company now, he expects even better results for the year.

Equally enthusiastic about P/D's future is Harold Butler, president of Denny's. He is a high-school dropout who expects his chain to earn \$5.7-million on sales of \$90-million for the year to end June 27.

The combination with P/D, Butler says, fits perfectly. Denny's, which plans to add 674 units in two years, is a big user of restaurant equipment, which P/D builds. "We can throw tens of millions of dollars into the company to fill production lines," he says. The cash flow expected will approximate \$20-million in the second year of combined operations and will help Denny's expansion as money gets tighter.

Butler says Scott is shaping up P/D so fast that he expects the hotel-casinos alone will earn \$7-million this year. Based on this estimate, he feels the operation is worth four

shares of Denny's stock, and he is unconcerned about recent gyrations of P/D stock. On Tuesday, it closed at \$107¼ a share.

Coleman, meanwhile, is hanging on to his P/D stock, and claims he has never sold any. The original distribution of 300,000 shares was bought with associates, and each took out his portion. In addition, he bought 50,500 additional shares between Dec. 13 and Mar. 28 at prices between \$68 and \$107.

Coleman, 42, has been an aggressive operator for years. In 1956 he bought into Seeburg Corp., the automatic vending machine company, and expanded its sales from \$25-million to nearly \$100-million. But he failed in efforts to turn Seeburg into a conglomerate, and last year sold out to Commonwealth United Corp., a diversified West Coast entertainment-based company. His other interest include a share of the Atlanta Braves baseball team and a seat on the American board of Noranda Mines, Ltd.

TWO VIEWS

Coleman has both ardent backers and vehement detractors.

Very much in his camp is Louis J. Nicastro, president of Seeburg under Coleman, who has remained with the company since its acquisition by Commonwealth United.

"Del Coleman specializes in financial management, and I've never seen anyone so fast in the ways of financial imagination and creativity," says Nicastro. Such warmth is natural; he made \$4.5-million on the sale of his Seeburg stock to Commonwealth. In addition, Nicastro's family foundation got 9,000 of those P/D shares at \$35, which will mean a \$1-million profit if the sale to Denny's goes through.

Less charitably inclined toward Coleman is Sidney M. Katz, formerly president of Kay Instruments. Katz sold Kay to Seeburg and worked for Coleman for a year. "My education under Mr. Coleman was fascinating, extensive, painful, and expensive," says Katz. The two men disagreed on the management of the division, and Katz left. Kay then was sold by Seeburg for a "very substantial loss."

Another Seeburg executive describes Coleman as "a financial wizard," but he adds that "as far as operating a business, which technically requires the confidence of a large group of people, he isn't much interested."

TEAM

All of this may explain why Coleman has let Scott handle P/D's day-to-day operations while he functions as a \$1-a-year chairman from a suite in New York's Carlyle Hotel. "Coleman is the idea man, and we are in touch with each other daily. But he has given me total control," says Scott.

While the combination with Denny's was being proposed, Coleman and Scott had been sifting through a long list of new names for Parvin/Dohrmann, hoping to find one to improve its public image.

"We have the list down to about 12 names," Coleman says. "It will be something with a recreational sound to it." Whatever the choice, and if it operates under that name as a division of Denny's, the company seems almost fated to remain in the spotlight. Corporate historians, in fact, will find fascinating bits of the past to amuse themselves. For example, when P/D bought its first Las Vegas hotel-casino, the Fremont, on June 30, 1966, the sellers financed the sale.

P/D paid \$1,581,250 in cash and \$9,656,000 in notes. But it raised the cash down payment and a bit more for working capital by selling the shareholders of Fremont 125,000 shares of P/D at \$14 a share.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 47

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, this afternoon I submit an amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. I will call it up tomorrow to provide much needed funds for certain educational programs conducted in the District of Columbia. In reporting this bill, the Appropriations Committee eliminated \$7 million of previously authorized endowment for Federal City College and its companion institution, the Washington Technical Institute. The annual interest on these anticipated funds—\$360,000—has been earmarked for two worthwhile and important programs conducted at these institutions: the cooperative extension program of Federal City College and the mechanical arts program of the Washington Technical Institute. The amendment would restore to this bill \$360,000, the amount needed and anticipated for these programs during their second year of operation.

Mr. President, these two programs are comparable to programs which have been operated in the past by various land-grant colleges throughout the country. They are basically self-help programs designed to enable lower income citizens to provide more adequately for themselves and their families. The mechanical arts program consists essentially of vocational training. The cooperative extension program involves education in the fields of homemaking, nutrition, family living, adult and consumer education. The institutions involved provide the vehicles for administration of these programs.

These kinds of programs have proven their value in the past. Their self-help approach is one which Congress has justly fostered in other areas. Their importance at this time of unrest and need should not be underestimated. And their particular significance in the urban context should be appreciated. These programs help the urban poor become more independent of public support and enable them to become more productive members of society. During its first year of operation, for example, the extension program brought needed advice and training to more than 800 families—more than 4,000 individuals—in the District of Columbia. With the income from the \$7 million endowment, officials have anticipated expanding the program threefold during its second year. The amendment would enable them to proceed with this expansion.

In light of difficulties which Federal City College has experienced during its first year, it should be stressed that the cooperative extension program is not an integral part of the college's regular curriculum, does not directly involve its regular undergraduate or graduate student body, and is not conducted on the college's campus.

In closing I would like to emphasize that in proposing the appropriation of \$360,000 for these programs, I do not view this as a substitute for the full \$7.24 million endowment previously authorized under Public Law 90-354. The House appropriated the endowment,

which was authorized in lieu of a land grant, and so this will be a matter for discussion in conference. However, I would want to be assured that the extension work would be continued. Adoption of this amendment will accomplish this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I received from the Cooperative Extension Service be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969.

Hon. WILLIAM B. SPONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPONG: This letter is in response to your letter regarding the \$7.24 million endowment for the land grant status of the Federal City College.

The endowment authorized by Congress (PL 90-354) called for appropriations in lieu of land to be used to establish agricultural and mechanical arts programs for the citizens of the District of Columbia. This is a fund appropriated only once which by law must be invested in Government securities and bonds. The interest in the amount of approximately \$360,000 is to be used for land grant programs. Such programs include the traditional agricultural and mechanical programs as well as adult education programs for homemakers and citizens. Washington Technical Institute which shares half (50%) of the endowment uses its funds to develop mechanical arts programs. Initial efforts have resulted in developing such programs as engineering, environmental science, and pollution abatement. The Federal City College uses its half in agricultural programs in training future extension workers, 4-H leaders, and nutrition educators. The funds are also used in extending educational opportunities off-campus to citizens of the District in a variety of areas.

The endowment funds are not used to pay the salaries of the regular teaching faculty of Washington Technical Institute and the Federal City College. The staff carrying out the land grant programs are not the same staff teaching the regular academic programs. These land grant programs are administered from our offices at the Mt. Vernon Square site, a half mile removed from our building at 425 Second Street which serves as the campus for our student body. This program has been free of any disturbances and may be considered one of the most successful sponsored by the college.

As a land grant college we also receive the United States Department of Agriculture extension funds as does every state of the union to carry on specific Cooperative Extension programs in such areas as 4-H youth development, home economics, and nutrition education. The following was stated in the hearing on the Department of Agriculture appropriations for 1970:

During the current fiscal year the Federal City College has available \$75,000 provided in the 1969 appropriation and \$38,400 provided for the expanded nutrition program. Programs of family living and nutrition for low-income families are underway, as are 4-H youth programs.

An Extension family center has been established in the far Northeast in the Lincoln Heights area in cooperation with the National Capital Housing Authority. Local programs are conducted there to serve people near their homes. Federal City College is planning with the Mayor's office to include Extension work in the model cities area.

The \$275,000 increase requested in the budget will be used to conduct programs in four additional community locations. The program provided will serve 10,000 members of low-income families through direct involvement in family living programs and 12,000 youth through involvement in youth programs. Also, the staff plans to make increased use of radio, television, and other mass media.

As we are completing our first six months in these programs we have seen that our predictions were indeed valid. Recognizing Nutrition Education as a dire need in Washington, D.C. the Cooperative Extension Service has initiated several programs to help in this area. Already more than 4,000 people in 800 families have been reached in our Nutrition Education program. Twenty-seven women, selected and trained by extension home economists, have returned to their own communities in order to assist low-income families in improving their diets. The program took on broader implications when some of the aides testified before the Select Senate Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and others appeared on TV and radio broadcasts.

As a part of Consumer Education lessons, housewives learned the techniques of buying groceries during on-the-spot-training sessions in local supermarkets.

In an effort to follow our programs in Nutrition Education, a telephone answering service has been established. Three-minute "mini-lessons" on improved family living are presented, followed by an opportunity for specific requests from the caller. These calls are followed up with the mailing of pertinent materials in an effort to keep a continuing contact with the community.

With particular emphasis on pioneering the use of 4-H programs in urban areas, over 1,500 D.C. youth have become involved in clubs which help them to help themselves. It has been possible to use existing mechanical, electrical, horticultural, home economic, and beautification materials developed by national 4-H offices for use in urban settings. For instance, training in mechanics originally used in rural settings on farm machinery have been used in urban areas on automotive projects. 225 4-H members from the 50 states, Canada, and Japan were joined by two District of Columbia members for the 5-day National 4-H Youth Conference. In this connection the youth participated in "A Day on Capitol Hill" where they visited with Congressman Nelsen and Senator Prouty.

The programs at the Extension family center have included Family Financial Planning Family Clothing Clinics, and Parent Education. Through continued use of these programs and the institution of additional ones, the center's aim is to assist families to more effectively utilize economic, material, and personal resources.

At the Lorton Correctional Institute, our programs have developed to include a full freshman curriculum beginning July 1, 1969, in order to enable the inmates to be paroled to the Federal City College as well as other area colleges with the advantage of having college experience behind them. As it has been found that over 70% of paroled inmates end up returning to Lorton, the hope is that this will reduce what high rate of recidivism considerably.

As the Director of Cooperative Extension in the District of Columbia and Dean of Community Education at the Federal City College, I work closely with the other 50 states in the direction of these programs. My former experience as Assistant to the Administrator of the Federal Extension Service assures me that they would concur with me that in less than one year of operation we have carried out effective, successful programs generally associated with extension service and we are pleased with the results.

The need for land grant programs in the District of Columbia is indeed great. The interest from this endowment which is estimated to be \$360,000 in the first year, would enable us to triple our efforts in these areas.

Sincerely yours,

EUGENE WIEGMAN,
Director, Cooperative Extension Service,
Dean, Community Education.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AN AMENDMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the able and distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN), who presently presides over this Chamber with a degree of skill and dignity "so rare as a day in June," be added as a cosponsor of the amendment which was earlier offered by the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) and accepted by the majority and minority managers of the bill, to exempt from the limitations, imposed by the appropriations bill which we are now considering, those expenses of the Tennessee Valley Authority paid out of the proceeds of its power operations, and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, as modified, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 19, 1969, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John G. Hurd, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

Joseph Palmer 2d, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Libya.

Adolph W. Schmidt, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipo-

tentiary of the United States of America to Canada.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18, 1969:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Harold F. Faught, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

James J. Needham, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1973.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 18, 1969:

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962, which was sent to the Senate on May 23, 1969. General Bunker died June 5, 1969.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 20, 1969
For actions of June 19, 1969
91st 1st No. 101

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....25	Food stamps.....4	Recreation.....2
Appropriations.....1,11	Foreign trade.....22	Research.....38
Air pollution.....6	Forestry.....9,32	Rural loans.....30
Atomic energy.....11	Information.....11	Science.....21
Chicory.....3	Interest rates.....7,18	Supplemental
Cigarettes.....31	Job Corps.....23,27	appropriations.....1
Conservation.....5	Legislative program.....24	Tariff.....3
Contracts.....16,39	Lumber prices.....32	Taxation.....17,36
Credit unions.....13	Older Americans.....29	Textile imports.....22
Disaster relief.....6	Opinion poll.....28	Transportation.....14
Education.....19	Personnel.....35	Water.....9,26, 33
Electric loans.....30	Pesticides.....8	Weather.....38
Electrification.....6	Poverty.....23	Wildlife.....10
Employment.....34	Product safety.....15	Youth corps.....1
Extension work.....1	Property.....37	
Food.....20	Reclamation.....12	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed second supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee "tentatively agreed" to extend food stamp program. Senate committees voted to report Great Plains conservation and disaster relief bill. Consent granted for House consideration next week of continuing appropriation resolution.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 87-2, with amendments H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969. pp. S6789-94, S6800-13

Agreed to the following amendments:

- By Sen. Spong, to increase by \$360,000 funds for higher educational activities which shall be considered as interest earned on a sum authorized to be appropriated in the D. C. Public Education Act for Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute. Sen. Spong stated this amendment would appropriate "in lieu of land-grant-endowment appropriation for the District of Columbia, a sum equivalent to the income on such an endowment. This will enable the extension work in nutrition education, homemaking, consumer and adult education in the District of Columbia to be tripled in the next year." pp. S6789 90
- By Sen. Javits, 89-1, to increase funds for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program under the Manpower Training and Development Act, pp. S6790-811
- Conferees were appointed. p. S6812

2. RECREATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs committee reported without amendment H. R. 11069, to authorize the appropriation of funds for Padre Island National Seashore (S. Rept. 91-261) and with amendments S. 912, to provide for the establishment of the Florissant Fossil Beds National Monument, Colo. (S. Rept. 91-263). p. S6739
3. TARIFF. Passed as reported H. R. 8644, to make permanent the existing temporary suspension on crude chicory roots. pp. S6733-6, S6816-17
Conferees were appointed.
4. FOOD STAMPS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "in executive session, tentatively agreed to extend authorization for the food stamp program through fiscal year 1972. Committee also tentatively agreed to report an original joint resolution increasing from \$340 million to \$750 million funds for this program for fiscal year 1970." p. D525
5. CONSERVATION. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1790, the Great Plains conservation program bill. p. D525
Sen. Dole commended and inserted an article, "Surprising Secretary--Hickel Quiets Critics by Showing Great Zeal for Conservation Effort--Skeptics Are Still Dubious on Interior Chief, but He Acts on Oil Leaks, Parks--Leaning on a Powerful Aide." pp. S6750-2

the utter futility of initiating nuclear war.

The possibility of the continued growth of Soviet nuclear forces to a point where a response on our part was required has been recognized for several years. The most recent review of that situation has convinced the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of Defense, and the President that a response to preserve our deterrent strength must be initiated now. This review considered the Soviet threat that exists now, the time involved in our making an adequate response, and uncertainties in Soviet intentions. The response proposed is Safeguard. Phase 1 of the Safeguard deployment is a light defense of part of our Minuteman land-based ICBM force. In the annual reviews of the program promised by the President, subsequent actions of the Soviet Union and the status of the arms limitation talks will be carefully considered in determining which, if any, of the options available in phase 2 of the deployment it is appropriate to undertake. In my opinion, this light defense of our Minuteman ICBM's is a prudent step toward maintaining the adequacy of our deterrent. With annual reviews it will remain responsive to changes, up or down, in the Soviet offensive forces.

Safeguard clearly tells the Soviet Union that faced with the growing threat to the survival of our deterrent force, had we elected to increase the number of our deterrent weapons, our action could have been misconstrued as a threat to their nation. Safeguard, however, does not threaten the Soviet Union. And—the Soviet leaders know that. I repeat—the Soviet leaders know that. While meeting our second goal—it will not incite a Soviet reaction and thus add to the arms race nor will it in any way hinder the initiation of arms limitation talks. The Safeguard program has as one of its possible future alternatives a thin defense against attacks anywhere in the country. This is not part of the first phase of Safeguard and would be undertaken only if future developments prove it to be necessary. We do not know how to defend our cities against massive attacks such as the Soviet Union could launch, except by letting them know that we have the capability of retaliating with unacceptable destruction. We could protect them against light attacks which would be the best Communist China might do for some years. It is not necessary nor is it being proposed to make the decision now to deploy such a nationwide defense. That will be decided only when necessary.

Then, it is necessary to set the record straight on another important factor—cost. The American people have been confused and alarmed by the figures quoted by some of those who oppose the ABM. They would have us believe the President intends to open the money hydrant to pour some \$30 billion, or even a hundred billion dollars into a program before the first phase of research and development is started. That, Mr. President, simply is not the truth. I submit there is a question of propriety in such rhetoric and when our

citizens are already overtaxed, it is indeed cruel to raise the specter of an impossible financial burden in order to deny the President the Safeguard he needs. The President has asked for only \$392 million to proceed with the initial steps toward deployment of Safeguard. This is less than the usual request for major programs and is a small price to pay for a step toward the continued security of our people.

Mr. President, if I may borrow from the vernacular of our youth, it is time to tell it like it is. Safeguard is simply a minimum prudent step to protect our deterrent capability in the face of a large and growing Soviet offensive nuclear strike capability. It is a step which will not quicken the arms race; it is a step which does not hinder arms limitation talks; it is a step which goes only so far as is required by the growth in the Soviet force; it is a step which is subject to annual review by the President and the Congress; and it is a step which must be taken now if we are to have any defense 5 years from now. It is a step which, I believe, the security of this Nation demands that we take.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Defense Department reports that for the week ending June 14, 335 American soldiers

were killed in Vietnam and 1,695 were wounded.

This brings the total number of such casualties to more than 42,000 which have suffered in Vietnam since the inauguration of President Nixon.

Mr. President, this war must end. It must end because it is immoral and because it is wrong.

It must end too, because it threatens to destroy us.

I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will consider convening the committee in public session in order to examine the question: What is the road to peace, and what policy, what action, would constitute a step toward peace, an appropriate policy for peace?

This, it seems to me, is the fundamental policy decision before our country today. We have been diverted from this principal issue by the attention focused upon the proposal to withdraw some 25,000 American soldiers from South Vietnam.

The key policy issue is whether the United States shall seek, and whether we will use our pervasive presence in South Vietnam to persuade a peaceful settlement through conciliation of the forces and factions in South Vietnam, or whether we shall persist in supporting and maintaining in power the repressive Thieu-Ky regime.

Now that President Nixon has "ruled out" a military victory, the political process seems an appropriate, if not the only, procedure for peace. What procedure or policy would be most appropriate?

This deserves and requires our attention.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) for the purpose of considering his amendment, and that consideration of my amendment shall follow immediately upon the disposition of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 47

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 47 and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 17, line 11, strike out "\$19,920,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,280,000".

On page 18, line 6, after "grants," insert the following: "\$360,000 which shall remain available until expended and shall be considered as interest earned on the sum authorized to be appropriated by section 108(b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31-1608) and shall not be considered as an amount appropriated under such section."

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, first, let me thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me at this time.

On yesterday, I filed a complete statement on this amendment along with certain correspondence pertinent to it.

Additionally I would only say to the Senate that this amendment appropriates, in lieu of land-grant-endowment appropriation for the District of Columbia, a sum equivalent to the income on such an endowment. This will enable the extension work in nutrition education, homemaking, consumer and adult education in the District of Columbia to be tripled in the next year. The fate of the endowment fund, which has passed the House, will be determined in conference. Regardless of what the conference decides, this type of extension education is badly needed at this time in the District.

I have discussed this with the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and others on the committee, and I would be pleased at this time to hear from the Senator from West Virginia with regard to it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia has discussed this matter with me and I have discussed it with the ranking minority member on the subcommittee. I think the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) has made a fine presentation which has reflected a great deal of research and work on his part. I commend him for it. The ranking minority member and I have agreed to accept this amendment and go to conference with it.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the able Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the amendment of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) (No. 40).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think that I shall go ahead, as some of the points with respect to this amendment are incorporated in a letter which every Member of the Senate has received, and deal with the basic problem.

Mr. President, the problem really involved here is the very deeply rooted one of reallocation of priorities in our country. I seek to reallocate an amount of \$55 million, which is no great sum of money, considering the problems and the extent of our budgetary expenditures. Nonetheless, it is a significant example of what people like myself, deeply concerned with our big cities, as well as our smaller cities, and with what is happening to them, have been bringing up before the Congress.

Here we are, coming into the summer, with more than 1,500,000 young boys and girls, below the poverty line, 14 to 21 years of age, out of school; the question is, What is going to happen to them this summer? This question is complicated, of course, by unforeseen events which could take place. But we already know we have faced a condition of concern and disruption not only in colleges and universities, but in high schools as well, and hence we probably do not face a tranquil national situation.

In addition, we are very cognizant of the fact that in the field of housing, health, and education, we have tremendous divisiveness and many dislocations in the country. I need only mention the terrible struggle, so bitter and deep, over school decentralization in my own city of New York; the fact that, for lack of money, whole school systems have been shut down in other parts of the country, indicates the incendiary material that is upon us. In addition, the measures which we have taken in the poverty program, the manpower training program, and so many other programs, have given some opportunity, but by no means enough opportunity, to make a dent in the mounting of poverty in the country. Hence, all of the combustible materials are there, and the outlook seems bleak.

The question is, What kind of summer are we going to have? I do not know, but I do know that I am certainly against asking for trouble or paying somebody off not to create it. I feel that when we have ongoing programs which have proved their worth, which are modest in cost, and which are a constructive contribution to the way in which citizens in the poverty classification can be helped, we certainly ought to do everything we can to enhance these programs to provide for the constructive utilization of the time of our Nation's youth. No one knows better than I—who have had a lifetime of experience with all of these programs—that you simply cannot force money into these operations the way you would force food into the throat of a Strasbourg goose. But there must be some capacity to use them effectively.

Hence, both the Department of Labor, which, by the delegation of the Anti-poverty Office, handles this particular matter, and the committees, and others, have done their utmost to ascertain what is really needed as compared with what is available. The real issue between my committee and myself and those who are supporting me—and I will read the list of the cosponsors of this amendment—is: Shall we provide what the Department says can be used effectively, or shall we provide what the mayors of the country, who are right on the firing line, feel can be used effectively?

We must bear in mind that, no matter what we provide in the Senate—and I, have served on the Appropriations Committee, just as has the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. CORTON), who are both in the Chamber—this matter will go to conference and some compromise will be hammered out. Or shall it be some figure in between?

Here are the bare bones of the factual situation: Last year there were, roughly speaking, 336,000 of these summer job slots. The reason why there were 336,000, and not something like 300,000, was that after an unbelievable struggle in the conference, with the tremendous aid of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. CORTON), and other members, it so happens that we got \$13 million more than the House originally allowed. So we had 336,000 slots.

The target population is 1,500,000 youths between 14 and 21 in the poverty category. The Department of Labor says that if you add 24,000 more slots to the 336,000 slots already provided—making a total of 360,000 slots—then that's making a total of all they think they can effectively use. That would require that the added appropriation which is contained in the committee amendment be \$10 million, instead of the \$7,500,000 provided.

I will say this to the members of the committee: The department has been moving on this matter. At one time, its figure was \$5.5 million additional. When the Appropriations Committee considered it, the amount was \$7.5 million. The last figure which we received, which was just the other day, June 17, moved the figure up to \$10 million.

I think it is a very significant approach to the question of a reallocation of priorities that the Department has been moving up its own figure as it has obtained more information.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors, which represents the mayors of 610 cities, happens to have been meeting in Pittsburgh this week. The conference feels that the cities need 136,500 slots. In fact, it adopted a resolution, which I agreed to report to the Senate, which was phoned in to me just yesterday, asking for \$100 million, not for the \$55 million which I have asked for, which is the appropriate translation of the 136,500 slots, at \$411 into \$55 million. They have asked for \$100 million, based upon what they consider to be their best information.

The \$55 million for 136,500 would stand in the place of the \$7½ million for 16,000 to 17,000 slots which the committee bill would add, and in place of the \$10 million for 24,000 slots which even the Department of Labor recommends. This number, 36,000 slots, is based on the actual survey of capability of use of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. It calls for 72,382 slots in the 50 largest cities in the country; and I put into the RECORD of last Monday a chart which analyzes that figure, and shows the additions required in each major city, so that Senators may identify and check our figures.

The 72,000 slots for the 50 major cities would cost roughly \$30 million. I am giving these various cost figures, because I think each of them is meaningful.

In the smaller cities of the country, the mayors estimate that some 67,000 slots are required. Now, because the data has been slow in coming in, we have only been able to get samplings from the various States. However, we do have a sampling of a smaller city from practi-

cally every State. So I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the RECORD a revised chart which shows the findings of the conference of mayors as to the largest cities—

which I have already presented—and also as to the smaller cities in each State.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State	Major 50 cities	Slots needed	Small cities	Slots needed
Alabama	Birmingham	421		
Alaska				
Arizona	Phoenix	1,343		
Arkansas			Little Rock	600
California	San Francisco	642	Compton	200
	Los Angeles	2,401		
	San Diego	884		
	Oakland	1,232		
Colorado	Denver	233		
Connecticut			Bristol	25
			Norwalk	50
			Burlington ¹	50
			Wilmington	200
Delaware			Orlando	500
Florida	Miami	501	Fort Lauderdale	100
	Tampa	586		
Georgia	Atlanta	420		
Hawaii	Honolulu	458		
Idaho				
Illinois	Chicago	8,846		
Indiana	Indianapolis	238		
	Fort Worth	270		
	Gary	370		
Iowa				
Kansas				
Kentucky	Louisville	1,080	Lexington	150
Louisiana	New Orleans	7,264		
Maine				
Maryland	Baltimore	2,363		
Massachusetts	Boston	814		
Michigan	Detroit	2,422		
Minnesota	Minneapolis	508		
Mississippi				
Missouri	Kansas City	350		
	St. Louis	1,200		
Montana			Billings	100
Nebraska	Omaha	188		
Nevada				
New Hampshire			Manchester	50
New Jersey	Jersey City	385		
	Newark	1,493		
New York	New York City	21,621		
	Buffalo	635		
	Rochester	461		
North Carolina			Charlotte	150
North Dakota				
Ohio	Toledo	82		
	Dayton	84		
	Columbus	456		
	Cincinnati	617		
	Cleveland	2,882		
	Akron	97		
Oklahoma	Oklahoma City	399		
	Tulsa	69		
Oregon	Portland	431		
Pennsylvania	Pittsburgh	1,343		
	Philadelphia	942		
Rhode Island				
South Carolina			Columbia	50
South Dakota				
Tennessee	Memphis	377		
Texas	Houston	970		
	Fort Worth	270		
	San Antonio	1,434		
	Dallas	495		
Utah	Salt Lake City	200		
Vermont			Burlington ¹	50
Virginia	Norfolk	616		
Washington	Seattle	285		
West Virginia			Wheeling	300
			Parkersburg	200
Wisconsin	Milwaukee	372		
Wyoming				
Washington, D.C.		3,014		

¹ May not have a program, but could use it.

Mr. JAVITS. The important point, Mr. President, is that the mayors are the men on the spot. They know the worth of the program, and they know the target.

There is no longer any question of meeting the target. I wish we could change the priorities of our Nation so that we could meet the target of 1.5 million youth in the poverty category, through action by private business, voluntary organizations, and Government. It would take a considerably larger appropriation than we will get here, even if this amendment is agreed to. But still the target could not be met, because they simply cannot absorb them; the machinery is not available. Let us remember that

this is mid-June, and we are figuring against a deadline after which it will not be possible to put the money to effective use.

So we have to adjust ourselves to what we can do rather than what is required. According to the mayors, what we should do, at the very minimum is provide \$55 million for the 136,500 slots. And, as I have just indicated, the mayors have just passed a resolution, an excerpt from which I shall read, asking for \$100 million. But they have been able to give me only figures to back up the \$55 million, and that is why I have moved for that amount.

The resolution, adopted yesterday in

Pittsburgh by the Conference of Mayors, reads in part as follows:

Whereas, the federal government through on-going youth activities in supplemental appropriations to the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Neighborhood Youth Corps provided employment and recreational opportunities to thousands of inner-cities during the summer of 1968 and will do so again this summer; and

Whereas, there has been inadequate attention given to problems of employment of youth between the ages of 14 and 16 by both government and industry; and

Whereas, the funding of these important programs, which contribute to constructive summers for thousands, was and is inadequate for needs in the cities. . . .

Now therefore be it resolved that the United States Conference of Mayors calls upon the President to request and Congress immediately to approve a supplemental appropriation of \$100 million for the summer of 1969 for Office of Economic Opportunity Community Action Programs, summer Head Start, and summer Neighborhood Youth Corps;

This is the finding of the conference of mayors.

Mr. President, this is the fundamental issue before us. I should now like to turn, as juxtaposed to the mayors' view of what is required, to the Department of Labor's own view of what is required.

In a letter of June 17, 1969, supplied to Senator BYRD, but of which they were kind enough to let me have a copy, the Department says:

The Department, after surveying its Regional Offices, estimates that it could be effectively utilize an additional \$10 million. These additional funds would provide 24,000 additional job opportunities for youth in the summer NYC program. When added to funds already available for the NYC program this year, the Department will have available approximately \$149 million and approximately 360,000 slots.

Now, Mr. President, we should not forget that this still is targeted at 1.5 million youth—

This compares to \$126,676,730 and 340,043 slots available for summer NYC last year and represents an increase over last year of approximately 20,000 job opportunities.

Then they go on with the details of how the program operates, et cetera. I add to my quotation this paragraph, which I think is very important:

The program becomes less flexible as the commencement of operations approaches—staff has been hired, arrangements for work stations, supervision, etc. have been made. However, the Labor Department estimates that meaningful work opportunities could be provided for the additional 20,000 youth if funds were made available in late June. Four thousand of these additional slots would provide the same level of opportunities as in the 1968 summer and the additional 16,000 would provide for some—

I emphasize that word "some"—of the pressing needs of particularly the larger urban areas.

We have obtained from the Department of Labor a breakdown of where these 20,000 or 24,000 opportunities would be provided, assuming that we got the \$10 million. That \$10 million, of course, is not in the bill—the bill calls for only \$7.5 million. I should like to make just a few comparisons, if I may, in some of

the most difficult and congested regions of the country.

Let us take, for example, the New York region, which is mine. The Labor Department's program would provide for 5,413 slots for New York, New Jersey, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

It is interesting that the estimate of the mayors for the city of New York comes to 21,621 slots, or four times what is requested for the whole region. This is quite apart from the needs of Newark, Trenton, Buffalo, and other critical New York areas.

In the New England region, the 24,000 slots would provide for 362 additional slots, and yet Boston alone, according to the certification of its mayor, needs 635.

That the mayors have themselves been moving up their targeting is shown by the fact that in their resolution they seek \$100 million while I am seeking \$55 million. Also I call attention to the experience of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON).

Senator EAGLETON looked over our chart for the 50 largest cities, and found that the figure for two cities in Missouri, to wit, Kansas City and St. Louis, were 269 and zero, respectively, over and above what they were allocated by the basic appropriation, which was 800 for Kansas City and 1,080 for St. Louis.

He checked on those figures, and found that this information did not present the updated picture. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Senator EAGLETON's letter, in which he says:

Therefore, I checked with authoritative sources in both Kansas City and St. Louis, and find that the number of additional slots those two cities could effectively utilize are as follows: Kansas City 350, St. Louis 1,200.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 17, 1969.

Re amendment to H.R. 11400 so as to increase funds available for the summer neighborhood youth corps program.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS JAVITS AND NELSON: You are offering an amendment to H.R. 11400 which would increase the funding (from \$7,500,000 to \$55,000,000) of the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps Program.

I fully support your amendment and will vote for it because I am certain the \$7,500,000 figure will not come close to doing the job which is needed to be done.

In support of your amendment you have had a table prepared by United States Conference of Mayors which purports to show the 1968 and 1969 enrollment levels in the program as well as the additional needs of the 50 largest cities in the United States.

The two Missouri cities on this list are Kansas City and St. Louis and your figures appear as follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS SUMMER PROGRAM, 50 LARGEST CITIES, 1968 AND 1969, ENROLLMENT LEVELS

Summer 1969				
	EOA original allocation (in jobs)	MDTA addi- tional slots	Total all sources	Addi- tional required
Kansas City -----	800	331	1,131	269
St. Louis -----	1,080	754	1,834	0

Especially insofar as St. Louis was concerned, I was very surprised that there were no additional summer job needs. Therefore, I checked with the authoritative sources in both Kansas City and St. Louis and find that the number of additional slots that those two cities could effectively utilize are as follows:

Kansas City -----	350
St. Louis -----	1,200

If you plan to introduce the table into the Congressional Record, I would appreciate it if you would also introduce this letter so as to correct the above-mentioned figures.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram received by Senator CRANSTON's office from the executive director of the Los Angeles Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency, stating Los Angeles could use 5,000 additional slots, rather than the 2,401 slots which the Conference of Mayors' table originally indicated on the basis of information obtained weeks ago.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., June 13, 1969.

Senator ALLEN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

At the enormous request of the board of economic and youth opportunities agency, we are submitting information in order that Senator Allen Cranston may initiate a supplementary appropriations for jobs for Los Angeles youth. The need is critical. Reports from public and private agencies and the state employment service shows less than 5 percent of youths already registered for jobs from poverty areas will find work with the current appropriation. School closes June 20th and we expect thousands more applications. Our agency working with public.

We can increase the number of employed youth in Federal programs at estimated cost of five million dollars which includes supervision and administration. We can add five thousand youths to the ten thousand currently being planned for.

MANUEL ARAGON, Jr.,
Executive Director, EYOA.

Mr. JAVITS. These additional slots for these three cities are not included in the \$55 million appropriation which we seek through this amendment. As I say, we did not have from the Conference of Mayors itself the supportable data to back it up. However, the independent inquiry of this one Senator indicates why the mayors feel that \$55 million is inadequate, and that their resolution indicates a need of \$100 million.

My amendment was very substantially supported in the Senate by Senators who feel a very deep responsibility to do everything they can in this very modest reordering of national priorities to deal with this very urgent situation. The Senate should bear in mind that even if my amendment is agreed, we will be dealing with less one one-fourth of the target.

In addition to the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the cosponsors of this amendment are the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the junior Senator from New York (Mr.

GOODELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY).

In each of those cases, Mr. President, what has appealed to my colleagues has been the real impact which we all seek to make and which can be made most effectively and efficiently on the basis of what can actually be utilized in respect of this very serious summer problem at the very minimal cost of \$411 per slot. Certainly, we can hardly conceive of a program having any meaningful effect at all which could cost us less per person than that amount.

For example, in the smaller cities scattered throughout the country, surveys indicate the need for this kind of help.

By way of illustration, I refer to the following needs of a number of our smaller cities:

Little Rock, Ark. -----	600
Compton, Calif. -----	200
Bristol, Conn. -----	25
Norwalk, Conn. -----	50
Burlington, Conn. -----	50
Wilmington, Del. -----	200
Fort Lauderdale, Fla. -----	100
Orlando, Fla. -----	500
Lexington, Ky. -----	150
Billings, Mont. -----	100
Manchester, N.H. -----	50
Charlotte, N.C. -----	150
Columbia, S.C. -----	50
Wheeling, W. Va. -----	300
Parkersburg, W. Va. -----	200
Burlington, Vt. -----	50

The situation indicates that although they are small these figures have a saturation effect in this kind of program, and that effect goes down the roots right into the soil, which is our Nation. Therefore, there is a tremendous utility involved.

The program has been going on for several years. There was originally deep concern about the accountability of funds and the tightness with which controls would operate in this field. The Department—and we certainly have to accept their appraisal—is fully certain that the rules and regulations and accounting controls which they have put into effect assure that there will be honest accounting and honest handling and direct benefit from these programs.

In addition, the whole problem of overhead has now been streamlined, so that we have a direct relationship to the very modest cost between the input of money and the output of value to the individual recipients.

Mr. President, government should share the problems of people and make provision for them. I do not consider the path government takes to be wise if it involves solely confrontation and the use of power to suppress.

We should do our utmost to do what is honorable and reasonable in order to meet the needs of the people so that they have no need to revolt. We can no longer assume that if we do not, within our means, meet those needs, that the people must nevertheless be quiet.

Mr. President, I deeply feel that we obviously cannot meet the total target of 1.5 million, although that would be the optimum. However, certainly we ought to do our utmost to meet the target which can be met, and that involves approximately one-fourth of the total.

We have the certification of the mayors, the men on the ground, as it were, as to what they can do. They have given us a certification now of \$100 million.

As I have stated, I have only picked up that part of their figure which is directly supportable, and that is the \$55 million contained in my amendment.

I deeply feel that, considering all of the circumstances which we face, the target number involved, the proven capability to get at least some of that target number, and the support given to the amount shown by the actual figures from the men on the ground, that this is a reasonable effort to reallocate a modest amount of resources for a very urgent program. Therefore, the amendment should be adopted.

There is one other consideration which I should like to mention in laying the matter before the Senate. It will be recalled that we are closing close to half of the Job Corps camps which deal with the same group, in the sense that the Job Corps camps take youths from 16 to 21 years of age.

Incidentally, in passing upon this amendment, it should be borne clearly in mind that this is one program which reaches the group from 14 to 16 years of age. This is a very critical point, because these very young persons, from 14 to 16, can be materially helped and are urgent applicants for this kind of assistance.

Referring again to the Job Corps, about half the Job Corps camps will be closed, releasing about 16,000 Job Corps trainees. The closing of these camps will save \$100 million, according to the Secretary of Labor. Our analysis indicates that a minimum of 12,000 young persons will be caught in the transition as a result of the closing of the camps. These young people have not been assigned to other camps or enrolled in other manpower slots to which they could be moved. They have merely been sent back home, awaiting redirection.

Besides this number, there is a backlog of 3,000 applicants who were ready to be admitted to Job Corps camps but could not be admitted because of the closing of those camps. So there is a group of at least 12,000 who are certainly entitled to high priority consideration by Congress. In addition, a considerable amount of money will be saved by the closing of the Job Corps camps.

It seems to me that both these facts underlie the justice of the amendment we are now considering. It gives us a saving which is almost twice the amount that is being sought by the amendment and also indicates the urgent situation for these 12,000, which requires the intermediation of Congress.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I was under the impression that I was a cosponsor of the

amendment of the Senator from New York. Through some inadvertence, my name does not appear as a cosponsor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator let me correct that oversight? I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) may be made a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from New York for offering the amendment and also for the strong, logical argument he has advanced in its support.

The need for more summer programs for youths this year is certainly great. Many young persons who will be eligible for new programs planned by the Department of Labor are not currently included in existing programs.

In rural areas, the situation may become particularly acute because the work opportunities offered by industry are lacking.

The figures used by the Conference of Mayors is ascertaining the number of additional slots necessary reflect these needs. Until such time as new programs are instituted by the Department of Labor, I do not think we can afford to let our Nation's youth spend an idle summer when they could otherwise be productively occupied.

I therefore endorse the amendment to provide for additional funding of this summer's training programs under the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I could not be more pleased with the support and commendation of any Member of the Senate than I am with that of the Senator from Vermont. He is, as it were, second in command to me on the minority side of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He is himself the ranking member of one of its principal subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Education, and altogether a deep student of this problem.

One other thing that Senator PROUTY has said is critically important to this argument—that is, in emphasizing the rural aspects of this matter. I am a big city Senator, though New York has enormous rural areas, and I do my utmost to represent them; however, essentially I am a child of the big city. But Senator PROUTY represents a constituency which represents the rural point of view; and I have tried to emphasize, through the mayors themselves, the impact of this situation on the smaller cities.

I am very grateful to the Senator for lending his personal support and prestige to the meaningful quality which is involved here to the urban areas, to the rural areas, and to the smaller cities.

Mr. President, other Senators may wish to speak; inasmuch as the manager of the bill is not present at the moment, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have nothing to add to the comments I made the other day, except to express my support for this bill. I think it is urgently needed. It is a matter of high priority, and I can think of nothing that would provide more hope to the inner city areas, in the heat of the summer this year, then the chance to usefully em-

ploy the skills and abilities of these young people and give them a sense of being needed and wanted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two questions?

Mr. PERCY. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I value the Senator's opinion highly, and he comes from a very big city. Does the Senator feel now that this summer program has been articulated enough so that he would have confidence in the fact that it would be well and honestly administered, and that the maximum benefit would go to the consumer, as it were?

The Senator is always given, I know, to digging into these things personally. What is the Senator's feeling about the way this program is run in Chicago?

Mr. PERCY. The distinguished Senator has asked me to certify as to the efficiency and effectiveness of the Democratic organization in the city of Chicago, I suppose.

Mr. JAVITS. Not certify, but just to give a kind of general feeling as to how he feels about it.

Mr. PERCY. I feel that the need is so urgent that the 8,846 jobs which I understand would be available for the city of Chicago—a city of 3½ million—could be effectively used. There is broad citizen participation now in this type of program. Jobs would be equitably spread throughout the city. It would not be just a racial program. It would go to the unemployed white, also.

I will be in Chicago tomorrow, on both the South Side and the North Side, with the Puerto Ricans as well as some of our black youth, to personally see, once again, what the situation is now. As of the last time I visited, a few weeks ago, a program of this type could have been used. I wish it had been in effect earlier than this, but I think it would be better to do it now rather than wait and take the chance that we are not going to have adequate funds.

Even though the funds for this program are the same as last year, with the increasing population, and the increasing number of young people relative to the population, we are stepping backward if we do not increase funds when we should be putting higher priority on this type of program.

Yes, I believe it could be effectively used in the city of Chicago.

Mr. JAVITS. I am trying to draw on the Senator's particular expertise. The genius of the Senate is that we do have men and women of particular knowledge. The Senator has been a very important business leader; and part of the effort to deal with summer jobs is going to depend upon business—the National Alliance of Businessmen, for example. It is hoped that it will do much better this year than it did last year.

The question I ask the Senator, as a business leader, is this: Would the Senator, as such a leader, be encouraged to do more or less if we indicated our sympathy for expanding the program by doing somewhat more? Some might argue that if the Government does somewhat more, business will do less. I would like the Senator's view on that, as a business leader.

Mr. PERCY. I think the inclination would be for business to do more. I do not believe that any businessman would feel this is the kind of thing that should be done entirely in the public sector. He has a great responsibility, and there is a sense of public conscience on the part of the businessman.

I feel so deeply about this matter that I felt we should not just leave it to the public sector or just to the business community to provide jobs. I felt that in my own office we should do more. It is a very small office, with approximately 35 people. But we have just had report on board seven students we have selected who I feel are eminently qualified. They need employment; they will benefit tremendously by an intern program. I feel so strongly about it that I am underwriting the cost personally, because I do not have an adequate Senate allowance for it.

I believe this is the kind of thing we should all be doing. The business community should do its share, but we should do the proportionate share that should come from the public sector; because many public areas in our cities need help. Additional boys can be used for playground supervision. Additional volunteers can be used in hospitals. There are all sorts of areas where young people can be put to work and gain a skill.

I mentioned the other day, with respect to my own experience in summer employment, that I cannot think of anything that contributed more to my own sense of responsibility and knowledge. One can see how these young people feel at the end of a summer of idleness. Many of them are eager to get back to school. The kind of trouble young people get into really comes through the heat of the summer, from being out on the street, and from idleness when they are looking for things to do.

We should find constructive things for those minds and hearts and hands to engage in, rather than nonconstructive work as a diversion from the type of activity that may cost far more in the end than this modest investment in the future of young people.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator for his assistance and support with respect to this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor momentarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go

into executive session to consider Calendar No. 4 on the Executive Calendar, broadcasting agreements with Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RADIO BROADCASTING AGREEMENTS WITH MEXICO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 4 on the Executive Calendar (Ex. B, 91st Cong., 1st sess.).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the agreements (Ex. B, 91st Cong., 1st sess.), agreements between the United States of America and the United Mexican States concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcasting band, which were read the second time as follows:

PART 1: PURPOSE AND SCOPE

Article I

Purpose

2. A. Each Contracting Party recognizes that the sovereign right of the other to use any of the channels in the standard broadcasting band is subject to the provisions of the International Telecommunication Convention and other applicable international agreements. The Parties further recognize that, in the absence of technical resources permitting the elimination of objectionable interference of an international character, agreement between them is necessary in order that the operations of their respective broadcasting stations may conform to technical standards acceptable to both.

3. B. In exercise of their sovereign rights, the United States of America and the United Mexican States have previously concluded agreements under which the establishment of their respective installations and the development of their services in the standard broadcasting band have been possible. Both Contracting Parties agree that any installations and services they may mutually agree upon at the time this Agreement is concluded and any that may be accepted in the future under the procedure established in this Agreement, shall be the subject of appropriate protection in accordance with the provisions of this Agreement.

4. C. Both Parties declare that the equitable and effective use of the standard broadcasting band and the protection of the mutually accepted installations and services are primary objectives of their governments and that to this end they seek to obtain the best coordination of the various technical elements involved in the development of such installations and services.

5. D. For the purpose of attaining these objectives, both Contracting Parties subscribe to this Agreement which contains the provisions that are to govern relations between the United States of America and the United Mexican States for the use of the standard broadcasting band, and they agree to take such action as may be necessary to ensure the observance of those provisions by private and other operating agencies recognized and authorized by them to establish and operate broadcasting stations in their respective territories in Region 2, as defined in the Radio Regulations (Geneva, 1959) of the International Telecommunication Union.

Article II

Scope

6. The following Annexes complete and constitute an integral part of this Agreement:
Annex I: Table of Clear Channel Priorities.
Annex II: Special Use of Clear Channels.
Annex III: Table of Shared Clear Channel Priorities.

Annex IV: Class IV Stations (Increase in power within the border zone).

Annex V: Specific Cases (Other than the special cases contained in Annex II).

Annex VI: Summary of Protected Signals and Interfering Signals on the Same Channel.

Annex VII: Summary of Protected Signals and Interfering Signals Between Adjacent Channels 10 kHz and 20 kHz Apart.

Annex VIII: Angle of Departure as a Function of Transmission Range.

Annex IX: Example of Computation of Skywave Signal Strength.

Annex X: Skywave Curves 10% and 50% of the Time.

Annex XI: Groundwave Field Strength Curves as a Function of Distance.

Annex XII: Characteristic Fields of Vertical Antennas.

Annex XIII: Kirke Method (equivalent distance) for Computation of Groundwave Field Strength.

Annex XIV: Maps of Estimated Effective Ground Conductivity.

Annex XV: Vertical Plane Radiation Characteristics of Omnidirectional Vertical Antennas.

Annex XVI: Joint Consultative Broadcasting Committee.

PART 2: DEFINITIONS, TERMINOLOGY, AND

SYMBOLS

Article III

Definitions and Terminology

7. The terms and expressions used in the present Agreement which are not defined in this Part, are either defined in Article 1 of the Radio Regulations (Geneva, 1959) of the International Telecommunication Union and are used herein pursuant to such definitions, or are widely used and commonly accepted and are employed in this Agreement with their usual meanings.

8. *Broadcasting in the Standard Band:* A sound broadcasting service in that portion of the hectometric wave (medium frequency) band between 535 and 1605 kHz. The emissions in this service are intended for direct reception by the general public.

9. *Station:* A broadcasting station which operates in the standard broadcasting band.

10. *Broadcasting Channel:* A channel frequency band for a station with the carrier frequency at the center.

11. *Clear Channel:* A channel designated for the operation of Class I-A and Class II stations only.

12. *Shared Clear Channel:* A channel designated for the operation of Class I-A and Class II stations only.

13. *Regional Clear Channel:* A channel designated for the operation of Class III stations only.

14. *Local Channel:* A channel designated for the operation of Class IV stations only.

15. *Class I Station:* A station which operates on a clear channel or on a shared clear channel and is intended to render primary and secondary service over extensive areas and at relatively long distances. According to the extent of the areas to be protected, Class I stations are sub-categorized as Class I-A and Class I-B stations.

16. *Class I-A Station:* A Class I station that operates on a clear channel and has primary and secondary service areas protected by other stations on the same channel in accordance with the arrangements set forth in Part 5 in Annexes I and II. The

graph (d) of this Section, the Contracting Parties will exchange yearly editions of the Official List through the Notification-Exchange Agency. Each edition of the List will consist of the original, or master, List of Assignments of both Parties, as modified by subsequent notifications of new assignments, and modification and deletion of existing assignments. The individual listings of assignments contained in the editions of the List shall be in accordance with paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) of this Section.

167. (b) Every six months, each Contracting Party will forward to the other Party a supplementary list containing notifications made during that six-month period. Such supplementary list will be forwarded within one month after the close of each six-month period.

PART 7: RATIFICATION, ENTRY INTO FORCE, DURATION, AND TERMINATION

Article XVII

Ratification

168. This Agreement shall be subject to ratification by both of the Contracting Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.

Article XVIII

Entry Into Force and Duration

A. Entry Into Force.

169. This Agreement, which replaces the Agreement of January 29, 1957, will enter into force on the date of exchange of instruments of ratification. The exchange of instruments of ratification shall be carried out in Washington, D.C.

B. Duration.

170. 1. This Agreement shall remain in force for a period of five years, unless, before the end of such period, it is terminated pursuant to Article XIX, or is replaced by a new agreement between the Contracting Parties.

171. 2. If not replaced by a new agreement, or if not terminated at the expiration of the aforesaid five-year period in accordance with Article XIX, this Agreement shall remain in force indefinitely thereafter until replaced by a new agreement between the Contracting Parties or until terminated in accordance with the provisions of Article XIX.

Article XIX

Termination

172. A. Either of the Contracting Parties may terminate this Agreement by a written notice of termination to the other Party through diplomatic channels. The termination shall take effect one year after the date of receipt of such notice.

173. B. If either of the Contracting Parties considers that the other is acting or has acted in a manner incompatible with the provisions of this Agreement, consultations shall take place between the Parties concerning the matter. In the event that such consultations do not result in a solution of the problem to the satisfaction of both Parties, the complaining Party may proceed to terminate this Agreement. The termination shall take effect ninety days after the date of receipt of the written notice thereof.

Article XX

Revision

174. Changes in and additions to the technical standards, including the conductivity maps and the propagation curves, and in the notification procedure may be effected through diplomatic channels when such changes and additions, embodied in amendments or supplements to the appropriate Parts or Annexes, prepared jointly by designated officials of the two Contracting Parties, have been approved by the administrative agency or department of each Party having jurisdiction over broadcasting matters.

In Witness Whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Agreement.

Done at Mexico City, Distrito Federal, in duplicate, in the Spanish and English languages, each having equal authenticity, this 11th day of December, one thousand nine hundred sixty eight.

For the Government of the United States of America,

FULTON FREEMAN,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

For the Government of the United Mexican States,

JOSE ANTONIO PADILLA SEGURA,
Secretary of Communications and Transportation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the basic purpose of these related agreements is to minimize and control objectional interference by stations in one country to stations in the other.

The two treaties replace the 1957 agreement which took the committee 3 years to approve because of controversy over the prohibition on presunrise and postsunset operations by certain American daytime stations operating on Mexican clear channels.

The first of these agreements—on broadcasting—is an improved version of the old. It deals with channel assignments, power, directional antennas, classes of station, engineering standards, notification, and other technical matters. The second agreement—on presunrise-postsunset operations—removes the controversy from the old by permitting such operations.

The committee had a public hearing May 27 at which the Department of State and the Federal Communications Commission testified strongly in favor. A number of communications from the industry were received—all in favor of the agreements. Not a single objection was registered.

New agreements are needed since the old one and a protocol extending it expired December 31, 1967. There is no present treaty obligation between the United States and Mexico on this subject. The new agreements will run for 5 years but continue in effect until replaced by a new one or unless a 1-year written notice of termination is submitted by one of the parties, so the present hiatus will not recur.

I ask the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification of these agreements.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD portions of the committee report on this matter.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the committee report, (Ex. Rept. No. 7) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAIN PURPOSE

These agreements concern the use of the standard broadcast band by the United States and Mexico.

The first agreement, referred to as the broadcasting agreement, governs this use by identifying and distributing channels, establishing classes of stations, prescribing technical standards, priorities, and procedures so as to minimize interference problems between the two countries. In general, it is very similar to the 1957 broadcasting agreement which it replaces.

The second agreement, referred to as the presunrise/postsunset agreement, permits daytime stations to operate for certain lim-

ited periods before sunrise and after sunset under regulations set forth in the agreement. This will allow for uniform sign-on and sign-off times for U.S. daytime stations operating on Mexican clear channels. This agreement is tied to the first one in that it can be effective only so long as the former remains in effect.

BACKGROUND

The pending two agreements replace an earlier agreement which was signed on January 29, 1957, entered into force on June 9, 1961, and expired on June 9, 1966. It was revived and continued in effect until December 31, 1967, by a protocol approved by the Senate on June 21, 1966. A second protocol which would have continued it in effect until December 31, 1968, was not acted on by the committee since final negotiations on the new agreements were in process.

The new agreements were signed on December 11, 1968, after more than 2 years of negotiations. While legally there has been no treaty obligation between the United States and Mexico since expiration of the first protocol, both countries have continued, according to the Department of State, "so far as administratively permissible, to conduct their broadcasting activities in *de facto* recognition of the provisions of the 1957 agreement."

The 1957 agreement took almost 3 years to obtain Senate approval because of opposition to a provision which prohibited presunrise and postsunset operations by daytime stations in the United States operating on Mexican clear channels. As already noted, the second of the new agreements relaxes this prohibition.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

On May 27, 1969, the Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the treaties and received the endorsements of the Department of State and the Federal Communications Commission. The record of the hearing is appended to this report together with those communications which the committee was specifically asked to include. In addition, the committee received many other communications from industry representatives, all of them supporting the agreements. Neither the committee nor the Department of State nor the Federal Communications Commission knows of any opposition to them. Moreover, throughout the negotiations the American delegation was assisted by representatives of the broadcasting industry.

Since the agreements are technical in nature the committee has necessarily relied on the testimony presented to it in recommending favorable action. The positive benefits flowing from the broadcasting agreement were summarized by former Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission, as follows:

1. A number of class IV (local channel) stations located within 62 miles of the United States/Mexican border, have been precluded by the terms of the previous agreement from increasing daytime power, an opportunity afforded other stations in this class by Federal Communications Commission rules. The new agreement provides machinery under which power increases of the border stations may be effectuated.

2. A new full-time operation is permitted on 540 kilohertz, a Mexican clear channel, in Florida, an area where such operation was precluded under the predecessor agreement, and some minor gains have been achieved with respect to the conditions of operation of full-time stations permitted in the United States on other Mexican clear channels under the predecessor agreement.

3. Many outstanding objections of long standing regarding station assignments in both countries have been resolved and satisfactory solutions have been reached in a number of cases with respect to proposed use,

of certain frequencies in the southwestern part of the United States.

4. Its implementation should reduce the number of conflicts which, under the predecessor agreement sometimes resulted from a lack of agreement on engineering standards applicable to particular station assignments, or from a lack of sufficient information as to the particulars of specific assignments.

5. No existing station will be required to change frequency or other conditions of operation upon entry into force of the new agreement.

The benefits from the presunrise/postsunset agreement are self-evident.

Another improvement in both treaties is the provision concerning duration and expiration. As did the predecessor agreement, they run for 5 years after entry into force but, unlike it, continue to remain in force until such time as replaced by a new agreement or unless terminated by a 1-year written notice from either party to the other party. This places these agreements on the same basis as the North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement (NARBA) to which Mexico is not a party but which for the United States complements the agreements now before the Senate. This will avoid future hiatuses such as the present between the United States and Mexico. On June 10, the committee ordered the agreements reported to the Senate.

In the opinion of the committee it is important that this hiatus be ended. The committee concurs with the views of the executive branch and the industry that these agreements deserve Senate approval and recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator state whether or not the Federal Communications Commission was consulted on this matter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, and it gave its approval. There was no objection whatsoever.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the agreements be considered as having passed through the various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the agreements will be considered as having passed through their various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolution of ratification, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

RESOLUTION OF RATIFICATION

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of two separate but related agreements between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Mexico City on December 11, 1968, namely:

(1) an agreement concerning radio broadcasting in the standard broadcasting band (535-1605 kHz), and

(2) an agreement concerning the operation of broadcasting stations in the standard band (535 kHz), during a limited period prior to sunrise ("pre-sunrise") and after sunset ("post-sunset").

(Executive B, 91st Congress, 1st session.)

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on this matter take place after the vote on the

pending bill, the supplemental appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the subcommittee of which I am chairman conducted hearings on the bill before us over a period extending from April 14 until May 20. There are 1,376 pages of those hearings. During that period there was no request from any source to include moneys for the Neighborhood Youth Corps operations, there was no budget estimate, and there was no indication from the executive branch of its desire to have such moneys included. I say again, there was no budget request. Moreover, there were no moneys for this purpose in the act when it reached the Senate from the House of Representatives, there were no hearings by the House on this item, and there were no requests before the other body for such funds. As a consequence, the subcommittee not only had no evidence before it which would justify the need for an additional appropriation for this purpose; it also had no request for the funds.

Mr. President, it was during the markup in full committee on this bill that the matter was first brought to the attention of the members who were present. I had received a letter on that very day from the distinguished and able senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), requesting an additional \$55 million. That was my first introduction to the desire on the part of Members of this body for consideration by the committee of funds for New York City.

At that committee meeting the able Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) presented the matter on behalf of himself and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). I stated then what I have stated now: The committee had no budget estimate, no testimony and no information on which to base a judgment. This does not mean that worthy programs cannot be brought before the committee at the 11th hour. It does not mean that at all. I am not saying that just because we have no budget estimate on an item, no request from the executive branch for moneys, or no hearings on an item, that such item is not a perfectly laudable one and that moneys would not be justified therefor.

I am saying that after the subcommittee had worked night and day over a long period of time, had listened to wit-

nesses and poured over the testimony and, after having weighed the facts adduced, had decided on the final figure \$4,456 million—which really amounts to about \$4.40 for every minute since Jesus Christ was born—we were presented with a request at the 11th hour to add \$55 million, which is not hay, either. Nevertheless, I am not saying that the program is not a good one.

But to come before the committee and ask for this kind of appropriation without justification other than a letter from the conference of mayors is, I think, a little more than one could expect of the committee. The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), who is one of the top-ranking members of the full committee, was present. He gave information to the committee that \$7.5 million could be effectively, efficiently, and economically utilized for the program, and he urged that at least that amount be added. That being the case, I suggested that the committee accept an increase of \$7.5 million and that the remainder of the money requested be rejected.

The Senator from Rhode Island appeared to think, I believed at that time, that that would be a fair approach to the matter and the most that could be hoped for under the circumstances, and the committee agreed on that figure. Mr. PASTORE wanted more than \$7.5 million, but he also was realistic concerning the circumstances.

Thus, today, we have come to the floor with \$7.5 million in the bill, and it is again proposed that we raise the amount to the full figure of \$55 million, an increase over the committee figure of \$47.5 million, or approximately \$1 for every minute since Rutherford B. Hayes was President.

I am not opposed to the Neighborhood Youth Corp program, Mr. President. I have had some very good reports from my State concerning the activities of the Neighborhood Youth Corps and so, therefore, I support the program.

So, on the day before yesterday, I met with representatives of the Labor Department and asked them, "What do you need? What can you effectively, efficiently, and economically utilize for this program? State it. State what you need. Lay it on the table."

The answer was, "We can utilize \$10 million."

I did not make the suggestion as to what figure they should state. I did not think that was my business to do that. I said, "What do you need?"

Here is a request now for \$55 million. I said to them, "What can you use? No matter what it is, tell me what it is. Lay it on the line."

They said, "\$10 million."

I said, "Give me a letter to that effect."

Before I received that letter, the distinguished Senator from New York knew what was in that letter. This is not said in derogation of him at all; yet he received, or at least saw, a copy of my letter. There was no indication on the letter that a copy was being sent to anyone else. But he did receive a copy of it before I had even opened the envelope to read what was in it, he indicated to me in conversation that he knew its con-

tents. Of course, the Labor people will hear about that. That is just an aside at the moment.

But in that letter, it is stated that the Department can effectively utilize an additional \$10 million. I will read the letter in its entirety. It is dated June 17:

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This letter is written in response to your request for the Department of Labor's position in connection with a proposed supplemental appropriation to be made available for use in the 1969 summer NYC program.

The Department, after surveying its Regional Offices, estimates that it could effectively utilize an additional \$10 million. These additional funds would provide 24,000 additional job opportunities for youth in the summer NYC program. When added to funds already available for the NYC program this year, the Department will have available approximately \$149 million and approximately 360,000 slots.

This compares to \$126,676,730 and 340,043 slots available for summer NYC last year and represents an increase over last year of approximately 20,000 job opportunities.

The NYC program operates in over 1,000 individual projects across the country. Operations have already begun in some States and are about to commence in the remainder of States.

The program becomes less flexible as the commencement of operations approaches—staff has been hired, arrangements for work stations, supervision, etc. have been made. However, the Labor Department estimates that meaningful work opportunities could be provided for the additional 20,000 youth if funds were made available in late June. Four thousand of these additional slots would provide the same level of opportunities as in the 1968 summer and the additional 16,000 would provide for some of the pressing needs of particularly the larger urban areas.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD R. WEBER,
Assistant Secretary for Manpower.

Mr. President, so, here in the letter is the statement clearly stating that the Department can effectively utilize an additional \$10 million.

I recognize the fact, as the Senator from New York has stated, that the mayors of cities are closer to the local situations than are the people in the Department of Labor. But in looking at the letter written by the conference of mayors and signed by John Gunther, executive director, I find that the conference says:

We have made inquiries as to the cities' 1969 needs for summer Neighborhood Youth Corps slots beyond those allocated to them to date. The information we have received from the fifty largest cities shows that the total number of additional slots that these cities could effectively utilize this summer is 72,382.

It goes on to say:

On the basis of our contacts with a sample—

It does not say how much of a sample or how many cities, whether two, three, one, or six cities. It simply says "a sample."

Continuing reading—

On the basis of our contacts with a sample of the smaller cities, we estimate their need and capacity to utilize additional slots to be 50 percent above their present allocation. This would mean an additional 67,313 slots needed by the smaller cities.

So the estimate herein is based on a sample. And how was the estimate arrived at? We are not told.

Mr. President, I feel that, as chairman of the subcommittee having the responsibility for trying to manage this bill on the floor, I cannot, in good conscience, offer to accept more money than the responsible agency has indicated it can effectively utilize. That amount is \$10 million. I am willing to accept that amount.

I know that the Senator from New York will be disappointed. I am sure that he would hope to see a larger amount accepted. But I think I must say that when we get this in conference we will do exceedingly well if we are able to come out with \$5 million, in view of the fact that there were no budget estimates, no hearings in either body, and no funding requests before either the House or the Senate committee.

This is a tough battle we shall be waging. However, I am willing to accept, on behalf of the committee—and I have discussed it with the ranking minority member, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT)—the full amount of \$10 million which can be effectively utilized, and this will be \$2.5 million over the amount allowed by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

If the Department has said it could utilize \$15 million, I would have offered to accept that figure. If it had said \$20 million, I probably would have done so, because I know that there are many Senators other than myself who support the New York City program. Even though the committee is at a disadvantage, in that it had no evidence on the matter during the hearings, no opportunity to ask questions there, and no supporting witnesses before it, I still am willing, therefore, to accept the amount which the Department stated it could utilize.

It said it could effectively utilize \$10 million and I am willing to accept that.

I hope that the Senator will agree to the figure and that we can go to conference with \$10 million.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First of all, a great deal of quiet diplomacy has taken place with reference to the item which we are discussing on the floor of the Senate today. As a matter of fact, my first contact with this subject came through a letter I received from the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). I did not talk with the Secretary of Labor. The figures I had were figures contained in the letter I received from the Senator from New York. I not only spoke to him on the phone, but also to members of his staff. I suggested at that time that possibly the best way to initiate this subject before the committee was to have it sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE).

That is the historical, chronological order of what took place.

Now, if my good friend from New York persists in his amendment for the \$55 million, naturally I shall vote for it,

because he knows how sympathetic I am to this kind of program.

I have listened to his rationale, and he is always very rational and logical. I think the money can be wisely spent, even the \$55 million. But we are here today not to win a battle; we are here to win a war. This is an unbudgeted item. It did not come up by way of a Senate document, nor did it come up by way of a budgetary estimate.

So when we were debating this matter within the full committee on the markup, I realized that there was little sympathy for the \$55 million. I am not saying this for any partisan reason; as a matter of fact, the objections came more from the Senator's side of the aisle within the composition of that committee than they did from our side of the aisle. I realized that we were up against a very, very serious matter; that if it came to a vote, in all probability we would not even carry 10 cents. At that point, realizing, of course, that the art of politics is always the achieving of the possible, and realizing that we might be doomed to get nothing as against the \$55 million, I pointed out to the committee that the Secretary of Labor had indicated that the amount he was asking for that he thought he could wisely use—this was based upon his communications with the various departments—was \$7.5 million.

So I injected myself into the picture. I suggested to the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) that perhaps the best thing for us to do would be to take the \$7.5 million, and then, if he chose to pursue it on the floor of the Senate, he could do that. That is what is happening here now.

I want to say to my friend from New York that here is where we are: We have come out of the Senate Appropriations Committee with a supplemental bill that has a provision which freezes in a cut of \$1.9 billion, no matter what we do. We received from the House a bill with a provision which stipulated that we could not spend any more than \$192.9 billion in fiscal 1970. That raises many, many problems. I know what the temperament of the House is. I have dealt with them in conferences. The Senator knows, too, because he has had that experience.

I do not know what we are going to do in the conference on this matter. I think I will be a member of the conference, because, after the Senator from West Virginia, I am the ranking member on the Democratic side. I do not know what we will be able to achieve in that conference, but we will have a tough row to hoe, because this is an unbudgeted item.

The Senator is suggesting that, inasmuch as the Secretary of Labor has revised his request to \$10 million, we should accept this amount. What I am afraid of is that if the Senator from New York brings the amendment to a vote, and we by chance lose it, and there is a very good likelihood that we could lose, we could weaken our hand in conference. If the amendment to raise the amount to \$55 million were defeated, the

House conferees would have the best argument; namely, that there was no taste for this in the Senate. So rather than do that, I would prefer to go to conference with a fresh start.

I realize that \$10 million is nothing like \$55 million, and that \$10 million could not do the job that \$55 million could do. On the other hand, \$10 million can do a better job than no dollars can do. That is the point I am making.

Without too much discussion on the floor, without too much controversy on the floor, I think that what we ought to do is to put our practical minds together on this matter and decide what our strategy should be. I am frank to say that if it comes to a vote, I shall vote for the \$55 million. Whether a vote against it would even doom the \$7.5 million, I am in no position to say. But the chairman of the subcommittee has made it his responsibility to contact the Secretary of Labor, who, in fact, is in charge and is the ultimate representative of the Government with reference to the efficacy of this program. The Secretary has said that the needs \$10 million, and let us not forget that he is an appointee of the present administration. The chairman of the subcommittee is willing to accept that recommendation and take it to conference. Why is it not the better part of judgment at this moment to resolve it in that way and let him accept it and let us take our chances in conference?

I will be on that conference. I do not know what success I will have, but I will certainly hold out for it. I will bring out all of the arguments that we heard advanced by the Senator from New York on the floor of the Senate. He knows I do not give in too easily. I cannot promise what our success will be, but I believe, frankly, that our chances will be much better if we accept the \$10 million than if we adopt the \$55 million figure, and then go to conference and perhaps get nothing at all.

I say this realizing the fact that in some respects I am being the devil's advocate; but, in the final analysis, I would rather take the \$10 million than lose the \$55 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island could never be the devil's advocate. I have served with him, and one could not have a better friend on the Appropriations Committee, or on any other committee, than JOHN PASTORE.

The Senator knows I have tremendous regard for his judgment. I would like to submit to him the details of what motivates me in saying I cannot do it. First and foremost is history. The difference between \$7.5 million and \$10 million is de minimis. If we are going to be dealing in those figures, I say it makes little difference. We are talking about 16,000 to 17,000 jobs at \$7.5 million, and 23,000 to 24,000 jobs at \$10 million, and we have a need for 136,500 certified by the mayors. So the orders of magnitude do not jibe.

Then, history troubles me. I would deeply appreciate the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island in this, because this is so much a part of our history. Last year I was on the Appropriations Committee, and I was a member

of the conference, through the great kindness of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and through the kindness of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) himself, as chairman of the subcommittee at that time. Last year the Senate voted \$75 million for this very purpose, under, generally speaking, the same circumstances. It was necessary to get the conference report rejected by the Senate. We successfully did in that fight, which was an absolutely monumental struggle, in order to get \$13 million, at long last, of that \$75 million.

Based upon that history, I would be very ill-advised if I were to wash this thing out on that basis. I know that if I went ahead, the Senator from Rhode Island would fight as hard as I did. I think he will agree that I fought pretty hard.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. No one who understands the motivation and the sincerity of the Senator from New York, as the Senator from Rhode Island does, will question him. But, speaking of de minimis, I would rather gamble with a \$10 million de minimis than with the failure of \$55 million. That is what I am trying to say.

Mr. JAVITS. Coming as I do from the largest city in the country and knowing the temper of my people, let me say—and I know it is a risky thing to say, but I say it with my eyes wide open—I do not think the poor of my city would give me less than a 95-percent mandate to fight for the \$55 million even if means losing the \$10 million.

I think that it is simply a matter of dignity. We are either substantially right, or we are completely wrong, and I think we are substantially right.

I have told the Senator from West Virginia, and I will tell the Senator from Rhode Island, that there is a figure less than \$55 million at which I am willing to be practical, but it cannot be \$10 million, and if that is the best offer, we had better just go to a vote and forget it. Therefore, I should like to address myself to some of the merits of what the Senator from West Virginia has suggested.

The hearings and the testimony are troublesome, and the Senator from West Virginia makes, in my judgment, a very sound point on that. Unhappily for all of us, this is endemic in the kind of problem we face in the summer job field. We even faced it with the last administration, which was in office for a number of years, but also had no budget estimate and there was no testimony, et cetera. I was faced with the same problem then.

The reason is that you do not mobilize and understand your situation until very late in the game. The numbers of youth who will be around, the numbers that private enterprise is likely to employ, what your regular ongoing, year-round programs have been able to accomplish in terms of summer employment—all of that information does not become ascertainable until along about the middle

of May or early June. So it is the kind of situation which is bound to come to the Senate, because that is where this bill is considered last and which is late blooming as it were, since you really do not know the facts until you get to the very end.

This is not unusual for this program, and I should like very much for the Senator from West Virginia to follow this. If Senators will look at page 2 of the committee report, they will see that the Senate bill is some \$600 million over the House bill. The reason, very logically, is that, first, there are new budget estimates that come in between the time the House of Representatives passes its bill and the time the matter comes before the Senate; and, second, there are other emergency submissions of exactly this character, and the committee lists several: Flood control and prevention; the Inter-American Development Association—where the legislation was passed recently; veterans-pension and readjustment benefits—which are automatic; medical care for veterans—which can never be anticipated too much in advance; and an item covering fire damage for the Atomic Energy Commission.

This is that kind of an emergency submission. That is the only basis on which I can put it. As a former member of the Appropriations Committee, I am very sympathetic with the Senator from West Virginia in his feeling about the evidence. That is why, perhaps a little unusually, we have literally put the case in, in facts and figures, right here before the Senate.

I account for that only because we just could not do it any sooner. There is no "latches" involved, as we lawyers say; it is just a late-blooming proposition. In addition, we have a new administration, and the Labor Department was completely preoccupied with its defense of the Job Corps camp closings, so that it spent weeks and weeks on that, and nobody could actually get at this problem. The best proof for that is that the Labor Department itself is very uncertain about its situation because, in a space of 10 days to 3 weeks, they went from \$7.5 million to \$10 million; and if we give them another 2 weeks, they will probably go to \$20 million or \$25 million. This is a matter of getting down to the grassroots and ascertaining what should be done.

There is another clue to what should be the proper amount here, I noticed with great interest that the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Rhode Island—though less so—used interchangeably two expressions in questioning the Labor Department: "What do you need?" and "What can you use?" Let us understand, the Labor Department is not passing on what they can use. They can use enough money to give summer jobs to 1.5 million kids, and they need that. The question is really, What can they operationally absorb? There we have a real difference between the Labor Department, which says they can operationally absorb \$10 million, for roughly 24,000 slots, and the mayors, who are the men on the ground administering these programs, who say they can use effectively 136,000 slots and \$55 million.

In addition, when you compare the figures of the Labor Department, which I did a little earlier, with the figures of the mayors, we begin to realize that the wideness of the disparity is heavily attributable to the fact that the Labor Department took it by regions, which is bound to give a very undue emphasis to the larger cities, and the mayors took it city by city.

For example, I used as an illustration region No. 2, which includes New York City, where its mayor certifies for 21,621 slots, but the Labor Department requests, for the whole region, only 5,413. Obviously, someone is being shortchanged here.

Finally, I should like to point out that the mayors have established detailed effective use figures for the 50 largest cities. I have not heard those figures challenged, though they have been in the RECORD since Monday. On that basis alone, the additional requirement—leaving the smaller cities out altogether—is for 72,382 slots, which would amount to a figure of about \$30 million.

So the order of magnitude suggested by the committee is really completely out of line, considering the order of magnitude of what, in my judgment, we have proved in the way of hard evidence, in presenting this issue to the Senate.

Mr. President, a number of Senators are imminently leaving the city, waiting only to vote; and I hope very much that we can get to a vote very promptly. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am prepared to vote, as soon as the majority leader and the manager of the bill are ready.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to be heard.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I would like to speak briefly in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) to increase the Neighborhood Youth Corps by \$55 million.

The need for this increase is accentuated by the support it has been receiving from the U.S. Conference of Mayors. This support is, of course, bipartisan and truly representative of all geographic areas.

I noted with interest figures furnished by the Conference of Mayors showing the need for 72,382 slots for youths in major cities and the need for 67,313 slots for youths in smaller cities. In my home State, the need has been indicated for 388 additional slots in Oklahoma City and 69 in Tulsa. Figures for the other 13 programs in Oklahoma are not available;

however, with the nationwide increase in need, I am certain that additional funds are needed for these programs in smaller communities.

There are few, if any, needs more urgent, or objectives more desirable, than that of helping the disadvantaged youth of this Nation. To recognize and meet that need is not only the right thing to do; it is the smart thing to do as well.

Investment in these young people through the Neighborhood Youth Corps program can make the difference between a life of frustration and a life that is meaningful. This amendment truly involves an investment and not an expenditure. Our favorable experience with the GI bill is a good example of such an investment and how it pays back great dividends to the Nation, not to mention increased tax revenues.

The investment called for is only \$400 per individual, which will enable young people to learn valuable skills and provide a viable alternative to idleness on the streets. Those who sense the future with optimism are not likely to turn with despair from the present.

Let us think, therefore, not in terms of "paying a price," but in terms of making an investment in our own future as well as in the future of these young people who will be served by this amendment.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) who speaks as a member of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders and who comes from a State that has a tremendously rural population, for supporting the amendment. The Senator from Oklahoma is an important member of the Democratic Party.

Reference was made to the 11th hour as to the way in which this matter was presented to the committee. I have already expressed my deep understanding of the problems of the Appropriations Committee.

So many of us from the cities of the country are worried that this may be the 11th hour for the cities. It is in an effort to make some contribution to the alleviation of their condition that could result in another very long and hot summer that I urge the Senate to support the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, if a Senator should rise and seriously suggest that we appropriate money for a space program designed to send men a third of the way to the moon and then leave them in space, he would be thought ridiculous. Or if we claimed to have a moon-landing program, but appropriated only enough for orbiting the earth, we would be thought silly.

Yet this is precisely the kind of absurdity we have been practicing for years now with our summer employment program. The need is documented. The documentation—gathered by the mayors of our 50 largest cities—is before the Senate. Distinguished private research organizations—such as Greenleigh Associates—have documented it as well. The summer youth employment program operated by the Neighborhood Youth Corps reaches only one-third of those who need jobs in the tense, hot summer months.

Which is more worthy a goal—reaching the moon in July or providing opportunity for those who face an American nightmare in the summer streets? Which is more crucial to the health and welfare of the Nation—not to say our domestic tranquillity—the moon, or job opportunities?

The amendment that the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and I offer today would not itself meet the need. It is too late to plan a program that is substantial. But it would provide the funds that the mayors of our leading cities say they can use efficiently, even at this late date. I urge Senators to consider the matter seriously, and to vote the needed funds, the full \$55 million requested in this amendment, funds enough to employ an additional 136,000 young people this summer. The need is for 1,530,000 jobs. That is a Labor Department figure for those who will be 14 to 21 and unemployed and from poverty homes in cities this summer. The administration is supplying funds for only 336,000. The mayors say they can use efficiently funds for another 136,000 jobs. For these individuals it can make a lifetime of difference.

As a footnote, one might point out that the Federal training situation for young Americans has not been helped by the shutdown of half of the Job Corps program. About 3,000 have left closing Job Corps centers, and only 225 were employed in other programs, according to the Secretary of Labor, by May 24. And another 9,000 who would normally have been recruited and placed in centers by this summer, will be delayed until fall because of the freeze on Job Corps recruiting and processing ordered in April. All these young people require our special concern.

I urge the adoption of the amendment to H.R. 11400 to provide an additional \$55 million for jobs for unemployed, disadvantaged youth this summer.

The Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) have informed Senator JAVITS and me that cities in their States can use funds for summer youth jobs greater than the figures shown in the survey supplied by the U.S. Conference of Mayors. The survey was a conservative estimate and there is certainly an even greater need for summer jobs than the modest sum proposed in the pending amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have the correspondence with Senators CRANSTON and EAGLETON printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., June 17, 1969.

Re amendment to H.R. 11400 so as to increase funds available for the Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,
HON. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATORS JAVITS AND NELSON: You are offering an amendment to H.R. 11400 which would increase the funding (from \$7,500,000 to \$55,000,000) of the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps Program.

I fully support your amendment and will vote for it because I am certain the \$7,500,-

000 figure will not come close to doing the job which is needed to be done.

In support of your amendment you have had a table prepared by United States Conference of Mayors which purports to show the 1968 and 1969 enrollment levels in the program as well as the additional needs of the 50 largest cities in the United States.

The two Missouri cities on this list are Kansas City and St. Louis and your figures appear as follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS SUMMER PROGRAM, 50 LARGEST CITIES, 1968 AND 1969, ENROLLMENT LEVELS

	Summer 1969			
	EOA original allocation (in jobs)	MOTA additional slots	Total all sources	Additional required
Kansas City-----	800	331	1,131	269
St. Louis-----	1,080	754	1,834	0

Especially insofar as St. Louis was concerned, I was very surprised that there were no additional summer job needs. Therefore, I checked with the authoritative sources in both Kansas City and St. Louis and find that the number of additional slots that those two cities could effectively utilize are as follows:

Kansas City-----	350
St. Louis-----	1,200

If you plan to introduce the table into the Congressional Record, I would appreciate it if you would also introduce this letter so as to correct the above-mentioned figures.

Yours very truly,

THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,
May 22, 1969.

Senator ALLEN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

At the request of the Board of Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency, we are submitting information in order that Senator ALLEN CRANSTON may initiate a supplementary appropriations for jobs for Los Angeles youth. The need is critical. Reports from public and private agencies and the State employment service shows less than 5 percent of youths already registered for jobs from poverty areas will find work with the current appropriation. School closes June 20th and we expect thousands more applications. Our agency working with public agencies can increase the number of employed youth in Federal programs at estimated cost of five million dollars which includes supervision and administration. We can add five thousand youths to the ten thousand currently being planned for.

MANUEL ARAGON, JR.,
Executive Director, EYOA.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, we have heard repeated many times in this Chamber the grim statistics on urban unemployment, Negro unemployment, school dropouts, and increasing crime. We have been told repeatedly by mayors and social scientists, psychologists and program directors, that these and many other ills of our society are closely inter-related. Yet we have continued to condemn the rise in urban crime, to cut spending for social welfare programs, and to deplore the unrest which plagues our land.

Such efforts are counterproductive. If we would deal constructively with social ills, we must take steps to preserve and to extend to all Americans an apprecia-

tion for the values which our Nation has traditionally upheld. We can do this only by making all Americans aware that the social system can adapt and change itself to work for all our people.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is a program designed with this very objective in mind. Under the present budgetary authority, 336,000 youths will be given meaningful employment this year. They will be employed in various capacities working for the cities and their agencies: They will work as recreation directors, laborers, and in other positions of assistance to the community. They will learn, as all young people with summer employment learn, the value of work and the advantage of a personal income. Many of them will use their wages to help support their families, and to further their own or their siblings' further education. The advantages which they and the community will derive from this program cannot be measured in dollar or social value, though the cost to the Government can be measured—a mere \$411 per person.

Unfortunately, however, there are far more unemployed and eligible young people than there are positions and funds available. The Department of Labor estimates that more than 1.5 million youths will be eligible; yet under present funding, slots are available for less than 22 percent, or 336,000.

Significantly, on the basis of a request for information, the U.S. Conference of Mayors has estimated that the 50 largest cities alone could use 72,382 additional slots. A sample of smaller cities indicates that they could utilize 50 percent more positions than are presently allocated, or an additional 67,313 slots. The total number of additional slots which our Nation's cities could make available this summer is thus 139,695. At a cost of \$411 per slot, the additional funding required is thus \$55 million, the amount requested in the pending amendment.

In view of the great advantage which this program provides, and keeping in mind the rather minimal costs when compared with other Government programs, I sincerely hope that the Senate will give to the cities the amount of funds they believe they can use, and will agree to the pending amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support increased funding for summer activities of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

This summer 1.5 million youths who are 14 to 21 years old will be unemployed and eligible for Neighborhood Youth Corps summer programs. But unless additional funds are approved now by Congress, less than one-quarter of them will be able to participate.

In the long run, it would be a tragic waste of resources to leave these young people no choice but to spend the summer months out on the street without work.

A summer job gives the potential school dropout modest earnings which may make the difference in whether or not he returns to classes in the fall. It gives him a chance to develop pride and responsibility. It enables him to perform useful work for the community which would not otherwise be done. It helps to

eliminate social and economic disadvantages. It provides an alternative to the aimlessness, and dissatisfaction and unrest—and to the trend toward crime and riots—which have afflicted so many of our youth.

Both for the practical reason of decreasing violence and for the moral reason of giving someone a chance to be a constructive citizen, adequate funding of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is important.

Communities across the Nation desperately need additional Youth Corps funding. The conference of mayors has polled its cities and concluded that even at this late date at least 136,500 more positions could be used effectively, if funds are approved within a short time. In my own State of Massachusetts, Boston requires 814 slots. In many other cities, the requirement runs into the thousands.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program gives poverty-stricken American boys and girls the chance to develop the skills and work habits, the education and work experience necessary to compete in today's job market. It benefits the community by supporting work on necessary projects. It serves society by developing productive and responsible and committed citizens.

It is a good program, which urgently needs our support as we face the upcoming summer. I hope that the Senate approves greatly increased funds in the supplemental appropriation, and I support the pending amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I send to the desk a substitute amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
Strike out the numeral "\$55,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000,000".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that amendment on the table. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) in the nature of a substitute. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable. The clerk will proceed with the rollcall.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A parliamentary inquiry is not in order during a rollcall. The clerk will proceed with the rollcall.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTROYA), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) is paired with the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN).

If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTROYA) would vote "nay."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Aiken	Harris	Packwood
Allen	Hart	Pell
Bayh	Hartke	Percy
Brooke	Hatfield	Prouty
Burdick	Hughes	Ribicoff
Cannon	Inouye	Saxbe
Case	Jackson	Schweiker
Cook	Javits	Scott
Cooper	Kennedy	Stevens
Dodd	Magnuson	Symington
Eagleton	Mathias	Tydings
Fulbright	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Goodell	McGovern	Yarborough
Gore	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Gravel	Muskie	
Griffin	Nelson	

NAYS—44

Allott	Ellender	Mundt
Anderson	Ervin	Murphy
Bellmon	Fannin	Pastore
Bennett	Goldwater	Pearson
Bible	Gurney	Proxmire
Boggs	Hansen	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hollings	Smith
Church	Hruska	Spong
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Stennis
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long	Tower
Dole	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Dominick	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Miller	

NOT VOTING—10

Baker	Metcalfe	Sparkman
Cranston	Mondale	Thurmond
Fong	Montoya	
McCarthy	Moss	

So Mr. JAVITS' motion to table the amendment of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia to Mr. JAVITS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am prepared to vote on the basic amendment but first I wish to explain to the Senate what has occurred. I shall take only a moment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order so Senators will know what the Senator is talking about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLMES in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have argued all morning and the RECORD is very complete on the question of what to do about summer jobs for youth. I proposed an amendment with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) and a group of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle for \$55 million which represents 136,500 summer jobs at \$411 apiece, which is based upon a survey of the U.S. conference of mayors. The survey sets forth names and places of cities and the number of slots required for the 50 largest cities and with supplementary data for smaller cities, all of which make up the total shown.

The Department of Labor advised me and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) that it could effectively use \$10 million. They surveyed the situation according to regional offices, by region, and they came up with the \$10 million figure, which I think is grossly inadequate and which the mayors think is grossly inadequate.

The Senator from West Virginia then moved to substitute the \$10 million figure for my figure. I moved to table that amendment, not out of any disrespect, but only because I did not think it fair to ask Senators to vote against any increased figure for the program.

That measure has now been tabled and so my amendment comes before the Senate. I would like to add one note of history so the Senate will fully understand the situation.

Last year, in 1968, we made a similar fight. A similar measure was bitterly contested here and it was bitterly contested in the conference. It received the kind consideration of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). Although I was the junior member, I was a member of the conference committee. We voted for \$75 million. The committee was very fair. As a result of the rejection of one conference report we finally got \$13 million.

I submit, coupling what we are trying to accomplish with that history, that it should be remembered that the conference of mayors certifies this to us as the figure which can be effectively used, naming the 50 largest cities and slotting them by the amount to be made available to each city.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. Is this money designated for those specific cities or will it get outside of them?

Mr. JAVITS. The money is not earmarked, but I do not think there is any question about the fact that the Department will administer the proposal upon that same basis. I shall tell the Senator why. Their breakdown for their figures on the \$10 million, which they did by regions, bears a relationship to the amount set up as the conference of mayors did. So the Department and the mayors would agree in order of magnitude although there may be minor differences.

Mr. STEVENS. My question really is

whether this money is going to get out to the smaller States, or will it be used for the larger urban areas?

Mr. JAVITS. Not at all. The mayors gave us a figure of more than 72,000 slots for the larger cities, and more than 67,000 slots for the smaller cities.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I shall be a little repetitious now in that I, too, want to say a bit about the history of this measure.

The subcommittee conducted hearings from April 14 through May 20 on this bill. It is a \$4.4 billion bill. There was no budget estimate, there was no request from the executive branch, and there was no request by letter from any member or any individual, to my knowledge, to my subcommittee asking for consideration and addition of this amount.

On the day that we marked up the bill in full committee I was first introduced to the idea by letter from the distinguished and able Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), in which letter he requested an addition of \$55 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, without testimony, without a budget estimate, without any hearings whatsoever. This amount, incidentally, represents approximately \$1 for every minute that has passed since Andrew Johnson was President.

That is not to say that the program is not a laudable one, not at all. I support the NYC program. I have had good reports concerning it in West Virginia. I want to appropriate for it whatever moneys can be properly justified and effectively, efficiently, and economically utilized.

However, I think I would not properly measure up to my duty and responsibility as the chairman of the subcommittee if I supported now an effort to put into this bill \$45 million more than the responsible agency says it can effectively use.

In the full committee, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), who is a ranking majority member of the subcommittee, stated that the Department of Labor as of that date could effectively utilize \$7.5 million for the program. I suggested we accept this figure and add it without any budget estimate, without hearings, and without testimony, but realizing there are many Senators here who sincerely want to see some money added for this program.

The full committee went along with the addition of \$7.5 million under the circumstances. Here now today we have the request again for \$55 million. On the day before yesterday I asked the Department of Labor to send someone to my office who could talk about this matter, and that was done. I asked the representative of the Labor Department, "How much can you effectively and efficiently and economically use for this program? You name it. Lay it on the line. Whatever it is, state it."

He said, "We can use \$10 million."

I said, "Put it in writing."

He wrote a letter and here it is:

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This letter is written in response to your request for the Department of Labor's position in connection with a proposed supplemental appropriation to be made available for use in the 1969 summer NYC program.

The Department, after surveying its Regional Offices—

Mr. President, Senators will note that the Department went back to its regional offices following the action by the subcommittee adding \$7.5 million. I shall continue to quote from the letter:

The Department, after surveying its Regional Offices, estimates that it could effectively utilize an additional \$10 million.

Mr. President, that is all I shall read from the letter at this time. I have read the entire letter into the RECORD earlier.

That being the case, I wish to say to Senators who were not in the Chamber earlier, that I today offered to accept an additional \$2.5 million over the \$7.5 million appropriated by the committee so as to round out the full \$10 million. I had discussed this with the ranking minority member of the committee (Mr. MUNDT), and he was willing to agree to accept \$10 million, that being the amount the agency could effectively utilize. But as I stated earlier today, I cannot justify my support of \$55 million for this program under all the circumstances I have related here.

The distinguished and able Senator from Rhode Island also took the floor earlier and stated his strong support for this program and stated he would vote for the \$55 million if it came to that, but he also urged the able Senator from New York to accept my recommendation on the basis that there was no budget estimate and nobody downtown had appeared here, except at my request, to state a capability for even the \$10 million. The Members of the House of Representatives never heard of this matter, never had hearings on it, and had no budget estimate.

The Senator from Rhode Island who has been in conference many times knows better than I that when one goes down that corridor and gets halfway between these two bodies with those men from the House of Representatives, without a budget estimate, without hearings, without testimony, and without a request from the executive branch, we are likely to come out on the short end of things, and we probably will not get anything.

I, as manager of the bill, or one who is attempting to manage the bill, have committed myself to support \$10 million under these circumstances.

I did not want to vote against this amendment for the \$55 million because that makes me appear as being against the NYC, and it puts other Senators in the same position. So, after having offered to accept the \$10 million, and after having had that offer turned down, the only recourse I had was to offer a substitute amendment to make the amount \$10 million.

The motion then was made to table my amendment. I would guess there were 10 Senators in the Chamber when the motion to table was made. There was no discussion on it. Senators came rushing in. Some went here, some went there, and some went somewhere else, as I do myself at times if I am not in the Chamber to hear the discussion and I have to ask a Senator or someone else what the vote is all about. And in fairness to Senators

we cannot be on the floor all the time to listen to debate. Therefore, I feel that some Senators may have voted on this tabling motion not really knowing the background, the circumstances, or precisely what the parliamentary situation was.

I hope that no Senator will take umbrage at my saying that, because I have done it myself at times, not having heard the discussion and I, too, could be confused about the parliamentary situation.

Thus, Mr. President, I take this time now to state what happened, why it happened, and where we are at the present moment.

The Senate voted to table my motion. Had it voted against tabling the motion, we would now be voting on my substitute to add the \$10 million. That has been tabled. Now if we are going to vote to add \$55 million, Mr. President, I have to oppose that. I think that any Senator standing in my place today would have to oppose it. I am sorry to oppose it. I hope that other Senators will be opposed to adding \$55 million now that they understand the circumstances in which we find ourselves.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator believe that any amendment on this subject placed in the bill by the Senate will have very little weight in conference unless it is supported by everyone in the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It will have about as much chance as a snowball in Sheol.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, that is exactly my belief. I served on the conference committee both last year and before when this subject came up. The Senator from New York knows as well as everyone else what difficulties we were under. I think as has already been related, they started with a much larger figure. We had to be satisfied with \$13 million last year, after all the conferees of the Senate stood by him regardless of what their votes were on the floor of the Senate. That being the case, I hope that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia will move now to reconsider the vote by which the Senate has barely voted to lay on the table his substitute amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say that the Senator from Florida is thinking much faster than the Senator from South Dakota, as the Senator from Florida usually does. I was going to make precisely the suggestion he has just made to our distinguished chairman, that we still have that parliamentary recourse, that many of the Members of the Senate were not here to get the background discussion.

As ranking member on the Supplemental Appropriations Committee, I can say that what the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) has said is precisely correct. He has been most accommodating, and most cooperative with the minority in the marking up of the bill and

in his consideration of every issue. We sat around with the staff and tried to work out a common approach to this thing. He suggested—the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) was unable to be present—in his absence that we put in the \$10 million for this purpose.

I raised some objections, I may say, initially, because no hearings were held and nothing was done. Finally, out of profound respect for the Senator from Rhode Island, I said, "All right, let us take it on to the full committee," and I went along with that position at that time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from South Dakota states the case very clearly and effectively. Naturally, we would all like to get the \$55 million if it could be used effectively. There is no question about the fact that there is a need for it. If we took it to conference, no one will miss it, because by the time the President signs the bill, most of the summer will be over. But my prediction is this: From my experience in conference with the House, we will "huff" and we will "puff" and we will only blow ourselves down.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Senator is exactly correct. May I point out that if all we do is to go to conference with the growing conviction on the part of House Members that the Senate writes on riders or ceilings and talks about economy, but shovels out the money in every direction as freely as possible, we will not have any impact on House Members. Certainly, they will be guided by the Department of Labor's capability to spend prudently the \$10 million it has requested. Having yielded from nothing to \$7.5 million, I am willing to yield from nothing to \$10 million, if they can compromise on that figure.

Consider the \$55 million. Of course the mayors would take the \$55 million. I suspect they never got to the mayor of my little old home town which has a population of 7,500, but if they wrote to him saying, "Can you use some money, 400 some odd dollars to a kid?" I guarantee the mayor would find enough boys to use that money. They may be spending their time now working, but the mayor would be able to find some who have not found jobs and he could probably build a case for that money. If we went out into the small rural areas, we could probably make a case for \$155 million.

However, we have got to be a reasonable in these matters. We will be confronted with a 10-percent surtax continuation. Some of those who will freely throw this money away now, will not vote for that, I suspect, and some of those who were opposed to the ceiling limitation are now putting this thing on. We will be up against some pretty hard financial decisions in this country.

If we can go for the \$10 million which the Department of Labor says it can prudently spend, I believe that we can at least justify that amount on the basis

that the administration and Congress would agree on it. But to go \$45 million beyond that, just because we are spending someone else's money instead of our own, I think makes us look ridiculous in the eyes of the House and weakens our own case and may kill it in Congress.

I therefore suggest that we have a consideration of the vote which the chairman of the committee says he will propose.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized, with that understanding.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we have argued this whole thing before, but obviously it has to be done again.

As I understand it, the motion to reconsider will be proper if made by a Member who voted with the prevailing side, and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) did. I gather he proposes to make the motion.

May the Senate understand the question so that it knows exactly what the situation is.

If we vote the \$10 million, we can come pretty close to forgetting the whole thing. Remember, last year, out of the \$75 million we got \$13 million because we fought—and I fought like a tiger. We rejected the conference report once which—with all respect—would not have been there if at least a majority of the conferees had not agreed with it, and that wiped us out completely even though we had voted \$75 million.

Mr. President, this is a battle. It is a battle which involves the cities of the United States. The cities of the United States are either going to fight for themselves in the Senate, or they will lose and they may go down the drain. This is an example of it.

Now we cannot just pass off this business of the U.S. Conference of Mayors—I did not write letters to individual mayors.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors certifies to the figures by cities, with the slots required. I have yet to hear it negated by anyone in this Chamber from those States, whether for or against this motion. The certification shows that in the 50 biggest cities, there are 75,500 slots required, and, therefore, at least \$30 million is needed.

We do not think anything about voting \$5 billion or \$6 billion for agricultural price stabilization, which involves only 16 percent of the people of the United States. When are we going to wake up in the cities of this country and stand up for ourselves for what we need, especially when it is de minimis like this \$55 million, and we think nothing of voting billions for defense and agricultural price stabilization, and for anything else under the sun, when this is needed immediately, for this summer,

this hot summer, with a million and a half of them tough kids. We do not even meet one-fourth of the target.

It takes a fight. I am not a bit discouraged. When we walk down that hall, as the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) has said, we will get our heads chopped off. But how much better it is to go down there with \$55 million than with \$10 million. The last time we went down there with \$75 million, we got \$13 million. We may have to turn down a conference report here. I anticipate that fully.

One wins in this struggle only if he fights. I intend, if I can manage it, to do it, but we must have some material to fight with; in order to do that, we must have this higher figure.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me so I may comment on the remarks made by the Senator from New York?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) has asked me to yield to him. I will yield to him a little later for the purpose of his making a motion, but in the meantime I will yield to the Senator from Rhode Island without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, just so we understand the history and chronology of this matter, the Senator from New York will recall that the \$75 million of which he was talking was in a supplemental bill, on which I was a conferee. The Senator from Rhode Island was absent from the Senate at that time for reasons that I shall not go into now. That conference ended in a complete failure. The Senator fought and he fought and he fought, and we got nothing. That supplemental bill went off the board.

When I returned to the Senate, I reintroduced the item in a supplemental bill. I went to conference, and was able to get the \$13 million. It was that amount over the previous nothing.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that we had to turn down one conference report before we got it?

Mr. PASTORE. That is right; but the Senator got nothing. That is my point. The question here is, looking at the practicalities of this problem, what is the best thing to do at this time? In view of the fact that we have an unbudgeted item, knowing what is the temperament of the House, shall we go into conference with an item which may result in our ending up with nothing, or shall we go into conference with an item that is acceptable to the chairman and the committee, an item that the conferees will fight for?

The Senator from New York must understand that the conferees from the Senate who will go to the conference are not Senators who will vote for the \$55 million. That fact will certainly weaken the case. The Senator will have only one friend there in conference, and that is PASTORE. That is not enough.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield further, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. All I say is that \$10 million is de minimis. As I said on this point when there were fewer Members present on the floor, the poor of my city—and I warrant it is true of all of our big cities, whether it is Seattle or Chicago or any other big city—will say, "If that is the best you can do, Senator JAVITS, forget it."

Let us grow up and have some dignity about this. We do not have to go to the House with a tin cup in our hand. If that is the best I can do, I am willing to do it, and I know my people will back me 95 to 5, and I am sure the poor of every city will say it—"If that is the best you can do, forget it."

Mr. PASTORE. Is the Senator saying that if he cannot get \$55 million, he would rather have nothing?

Mr. JAVITS. All I said is that we have to run this risk, because the poor people have dignity, too, and if all the Senate can do for a summer employment program is to allow \$10 million when we face this issue, then my people will back me in risking a try at getting \$55 million.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Dakota without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I cannot help but resent and take exception to what the Senator from New York had to say about the farmers of the country. They are the lowest paid people in the whole United States. The prices they receive today, which represents their wages, are lower than they were 20 years ago. The Senator ought to know, because he has been on the Appropriations Committee, that \$1.5 billion of the agriculture appropriation bill is for family food and school lunches. This goes mostly to city people. The farmers get less than half of the agriculture budget for price supports. He says \$7 billion is being thrown to the farmers, when they are the lowest income people in the whole country.

I am willing to help the cities, but I do not want the farmers to be treated in an objectionable or unfair way.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield, under the same conditions.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if I did say that, I apologize. I had no such intention. I was only comparing the orders of magnitude, as to what the people of the cities contend for and what the farmers contend for. I only pointed out that we have an enormous need here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida under the same condition.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, further along the line just mentioned by the Senator from North Dakota, I want to call to the attention of the Senator from New York the fact that the cities are not forgotten by the Appropriations Committee. I have jotted down here just a few of the very generous appropriations

are making for the cities, and we ought to make them, and we are making them. One is for the model cities appropriation. That certainly does not apply to farmers or to rural areas. Another is for the open space appropriation, for spaces around the cities. Both of those are large appropriations. The third is for the urban transportation system, which is certainly not for the country areas and not for the farmers. The fourth is for urban public housing, which is certainly not for the farmers and not for the open areas.

There are many, many other appropriations, such as the special rent appropriation and the special provisions in the recent housing bill to pay interest to help dwellers in the cities to build their homes and the vast appropriations to build airports and harbors at the cities.

We are not blind to the needs of the cities, and I think the cities know that.

I have not even mentioned the aid we are giving to the police systems of the Nation. Of course, that applies largely to the urban areas.

The fact is—and I go back to a point I made a while ago—I want there to be in this bill the item which the administration says it can use; and the administration is not unsympathetic to this need. I would think the distinguished Senator from New York recognizes that fact, because he is a member of the party of that administration. The administration says \$10 million is the most it can use.

I want to remind all Senators who are here of the fact that an amendment adopted here by a bare vote of the Senate, with just a small majority, is not going to have the weight in conference as would an amendment adopted by an almost unanimous vote of the Senate. I would hope that the Senate could vote with almost unanimity for the \$10 million. I would be prepared to vote for that figure since the Department now says it can use that amount. It formerly had said it could use only \$7.5 million.

As the Senator from West Virginia knows, I voted at the markup of the bill for that amount because the Department had said it could use it. The question is, Shall we go out of here with practically a unanimous show on the part of the Senate that it wants this program to be served by an amount which this administration says can be used, or shall we go out of here badly divided, to a conference where we know we are up against great difficulties, committed to an amount which cannot be used?

I think the position of the Senator from West Virginia is so strong, so unassailable, that I unhesitatingly support it. I hope the motion for reconsideration will be made, and that it will be adopted by the Senate, and that the Senate can then, with practical unanimity, vote for the \$10 million amount.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the able and distinguished Senator. Such a motion will be made. The Senator from Alabama asked me to yield to him.

First, I yield to the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I did not

become aware of the so-called letter until a few minutes ago. Do I understand the administering agency says the maximum amount it can use is \$10 million?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct, and the manager of the bill offered to accept that amount, but the distinguished Senator from New York would not agree to it.

Mr. CANNON. What would be the total amount available then for use in this program?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the total amount, with the \$10 million, would be \$149,500,000, which would provide about 360,000 slots for summer jobs. My argument, just so the Senator gets the picture—I am not trying to be forensic about it—is that we have got a target of a million and a half to shoot at; the Labor Department certifies that. My amendment was based upon the findings, city by city, of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which gives us a figure for effective use—just the same catechism as that of the Labor Department—of 136,500 slots, as against their 24,000 slots, making a total of \$55 million instead of their \$10 million.

That is the issue.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in further response to the question of the Senator from Nevada, I shall read this additional sentence into the RECORD, which immediately follows what I had already read:

When added to funds already available for the NYC program this year, the Department will have available approximately \$149 million and approximately 360,000 slots.

Mr. CANNON. Does that increase the number of slots that were available last year?

Mr. JAVITS. It increases the number by about 14,000.

Mr. CANNON. It increases the total money?

Mr. JAVITS. It increases the total money; and, of course, the whole point we make is that we have now got a bigger target, and a more difficult situation.

Mr. CANNON. But the administration has said it can use only \$10 million?

Mr. JAVITS. That is the amount they certify they can effectively use, that is a fact; we cannot get away from that.

Mr. CANNON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that I asked him to yield for the purpose of permitting me to speak on the pending amendment at this time.

Mr. President, I voted to lay on the table the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia providing for \$10 million, not because I favored the \$55 million, but because I was against the increase to \$10 million. The distinguished Senator from New York stated that he would prefer not to take the \$10 million, that he regarded the increase from \$7.5 to \$10 million as a mere pittance.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to give him my exact words.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I said I regarded it as *de minimis*—not enough of a change in the order of magnitude to make it desirable.

Mr. ALLEN. If I misquoted the Senator, I apologize to him. The RECORD will show, I am sure.

At any rate, the distinguished Senator from New York was unwilling to accept the \$2.5 million increase proposed by the Byrd amendment, and for that reason I voted not to force the \$10 million on him. I would much prefer to see the issue presented to the Senate on the \$7.5 million proposed in the bill, or the \$55 million proposed by the Javits amendment. It was for that reason that I voted to table the \$10 million amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD).

I would still prefer to see the issue presented to the Senate as \$7.5 million or \$55 million, feeling confident that the Senate would accept the \$7.5 million figure. I feel that the \$7.5 million is certainly all that should be appropriated, and I do not favor going to \$10 million. Certainly, if the proposed \$55 million is to be spent according to the provisions of the bill by September 30 of this year, it would be a problem to spend wisely that amount of money for the intended purposes in that time.

I feel that this attitude toward the expenditure of public funds, this feeling that \$2.5 million, or \$45 million, is a small amount of money, is a feeling or an attitude or a view that has contributed to getting the country in the terrible financial position that it is in today. So I am opposed to the \$10 million amendment, and I am opposed to the \$55 million, and I would prefer to vote against the \$55 million at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move, by way of offering a substitute amendment, that the figure \$55 million be stricken—

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. President, I withdraw my motion.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, having voted with the prevailing side on the motion of the Senator from New York to table the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, I now move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which that motion was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a point of order. Does the Senator qualify?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama voted on the prevailing side, and does qualify.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, if the Chair will indulge me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it appropriate to move to reconsider a vote on a motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is appropriate.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) to lay on the table the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was agreed to. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA) would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) is paired with the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON).

If present and voting, the Senator from Alabama would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Aiken	Dominick	Miller
Allen	Eastland	Mundt
Allott	Ellender	Murphy
Anderson	Ervin	Pastore
Bellmon	Fannin	Pearson
Bennett	Goldwater	Proxmire
Bible	Gravel	Randolph
Boggs	Gurney	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Smith
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Spong
Cannon	Hollings	Stennis
Church	Hruska	Stevens
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Curtis	Long	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Dodd	McClellan	
Dole	Metcalf	

NAYS—40

Bayh	Hughes	Pell
Brooke	Inouye	Percy
Burdick	Jackson	Prouty
Case	Javits	Ribicoff
Cooper	Kennedy	Saxbe
Eagleton	Magnuson	Schweiker
Fulbright	Mathias	Scott
Goodell	McCarthy	Symington
Gore	McGee	Tydings
Griffin	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Harris	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hart	Muskie	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Nelson	
Hatfield	Packwood	

NOT VOTING—8

Baker	Mondale	Sparkman
Cranston	Montoya	Thurmond
Fong	Moss	

So Mr. ALLEN's motion to reconsider the vote by which Mr. BYRD's amend-

ment in the nature of a substitute was laid on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the motion to table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest that it is unnecessary to have a rollcall vote on this question. The Senate has manifested its will. Therefore, if the Senator would make a unanimous-consent request to vacate the order for a rollcall vote, I will not object.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a rollcall vote on the motion to table be vacated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that the order for a yea-and-nay vote on the motion to table be vacated? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand the procedure, we are now to vote orally on the motion to table. The motion to table has been reconsidered; the order for the yeas and nays has been vacated. As I understand it, we vote on the motion to table.

If that motion is rejected on a viva voce vote, then the floor is open for debate on the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia. Am I correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I have not heard anyone call for a vote on the motion to table as yet.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request for the yeas and nays has been withdrawn.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would like recognition on the substitute.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and the nays on the substitute.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long.

May we have order, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, having scrambled and unscrambled these eggs in the course of the last few hours, and being back about where we started, I respectfully submit that it is not imposing upon the Senate to put this issue before it very clearly.

There are 50 cities in the country, the 50 largest cities—it is in the RECORD as of Monday; there is no question about this. We have the certification of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, city by city, of the number of slots that are needed, which the conference certifies can be administered effectively. The number of

jobs is more than 75,000, which multiplied by \$411 means at least \$30 million.

Mr. President, if the Senate is going to settle for \$10 million, this whole thing could easily be washed out into nothing. I do not know what the attitude is in the other body; the last time we were there, it was a tremendous struggle, and it took a number of weeks to work it out. First we had to go up the hill of a conference report, which the Senate rejected. The conference was absolutely deadlocked. Finally, as the Senator from Rhode Island has said, we came back; and with his tremendous help and due to my own stubbornness and the assistance of other members of the Appropriations Committee, we got \$13 million. That was from \$75 million.

The Department of Labor, which is the same Department of Labor, has had to close half the Job Corps camps for budgetary reasons. In the space of a few days, it escalated its own estimate to what could be used effectively from \$7½ million to \$10 million. It should be remembered that the committee put in \$7½ million, because that is what the Labor Department had advised they could effectively use. Yet, within a few days thereafter, the Department of Labor came up with a \$10 million figure. That is 33⅓ percent more. Give them another few days, Mr. President, and they will come up with \$20 or \$30 million.

The mayors are on the firing line here, and they understand the situation they face in their cities. They have certified this to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and they think they are short; because the U.S. Conference of Mayors, only yesterday, in Pittsburgh, by formal resolution, asked for \$100 million. My amendment would provide 72,000 slots for the larger cities, and practically every Member of the Senate has at least one of these cities in his own State. This number of slots is in addition to their estimate, based on samplings State by State, of more than 67,000 slots for small cities. Inasmuch as the big city list of 50 cities omits any smaller cities, some small cities must be involved somewhere. So it is 75,000 slots plus, at the very least.

Mr. President, the history of this conference is that if you go in with \$10 million, you are likely to come out with nothing; and if they bring it back to the Senate with nothing or with some insignificant sum and we reject the conference report, people like myself will be told, "There is not much involved, anyway. There are only a few thousand jobs. Why do you not take the conference report and forget it? You are lost for this year."

Right now, we are not lost for this year. It may be that some Senators who voted to reconsider were unwilling to let the matter rest on the basis of a tabling motion and wanted, rather, to vote on the merits, up or down. I hope so, because this is a measure of elementary importance to the security of our country. Our country is gravely endangered from within. As a big-city Senator, I can tell my colleagues—I think it will be vouched for by every other big-city Senator, and that means practically all of us—that what happens in these cities could very

well be determined by the extent to which the summer job program is effectively handled and the numbers it covers.

So, Mr. President, I feel that I am shooting for the main target on behalf of myself and my colleagues in respect of this particular vote.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I would like to help the Senator in his very worthy objective, because I know he has the best of intentions, and I know that if we achieve the objectives, a great deal of good can be done. However, I do feel that \$10 million is better than \$7½ million, as far as it will go. I have a feeling that if we reject the \$10 million, we may wind up with \$7½ million, and that means we will get absolutely nothing in conference. If we take the \$10 million, I believe the conferees will allow at least half of that, which will not go very far. It can go \$5 million further than nothing at all.

For that reason, having observed the machinations of the Senate for quite some time, I feel that it would be to our best advantage to accept the \$10 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator knows that I not only respect him but also love him, and I say this to him with all seriousness. Unless we fight for this thing, nothing will come of it. And the only way we can show fight—I have been through this—is by sustaining a strong figure; otherwise the other body does not have any respect for it and it is approved with half a heart. Even at that time the chances are 50-50 that before we get any figure we will have to turn down one conference report.

In view of the fact that I think the \$55 million figure, as I have read before the Senate in detail, is supported by many Senators having the view of the Senator from Vermont we should get something of substance out of it.

I assure Senators, based on my experience, what will happen when they walk down that hall to the conference. I sat there not one time but 20 times, because we had this difficulty, and then we had to get the conference report rejected. Only then, with the marvelous support of the Senator from Rhode Island were we able to get \$13 million out of the \$75 million for which we voted.

On that record I submit that anyone feeling as the Senator from Vermont does should support me and not the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. AIKEN. No one can say the Senator did not put up a worthy and commendable fight in this matter. However, I have an idea that when the conference report comes back I think I can assure the Senator from New York if it does not contain a substantial amount for this purpose I would not favor the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I think the Senate has heard enough on this subject. I am prepared to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the

amendment of the Senator from New York. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTAÑA), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTAÑA), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) would each vote yea.

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 18, as follows:

[No. 43 Leg.]

YEAS—73

Alken	Fulbright	Murphy
Allott	Goldwater	Muskie
Anderson	Gravel	Packwood
Bayh	Griffin	Pastore
Bellmon	Hansen	Pearson
Bennett	Hartke	Pell
Bible	Hatfield	Percy
Boggs	Holland	Prouty
Brooke	Hollings	Proxmire
Burdick	Hruska	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hughes	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Russell
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Smith
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Spong
Cook	Kennedy	Stennis
Cotton	Long	Stevens
Curtis	Mansfield	Symington
Dirksen	Mathias	Talmadge
Dodd	McClellan	Tower
Dole	McGee	Tydings
Dominick	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Miller	
Fannin	Mundt	

NAYS—18

Allen	Gurney	Nelson
Case	Harris	Saxbe
Cooper	Hart	Schweiker
Eagleton	Jackson	Scott
Goodell	Javits	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Magnuson	Yarborough

NOT VOTING—9

Baker	McCarthy	Moss
Cranston	MonDALE	Sparkman
Fong	Montoya	Thurmond

So the amendment of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia to the amendment of Mr. JAVITS was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Appropriations Committee has had its way. Let us understand that. The Appropriations Committee has had its way.

I shall look with the greatest interest to what they bring in as a result of the conference.

We are not through with this fight by a long sight. It is a long and continuing problem of the cities. This is an example of it.

I have been here a long time. I am not a bit bitter about it, but I just am saying that every word I speak I mean. I have been on the Appropriations Committee and it is a very powerful committee. It has had its way.

Now, let us see what they do with this in conference.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) as amended be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think we should have a vote on my amendment as amended. There are Members who voted "nay" on the substitute because, like myself, they had a sense of principle about it.

Therefore, if the motion for the yeas and nays has already been vacated—I do not know whether I spoke soon enough—I ask the Chair whether I did, and if I did not, I will ask for the yeas and nays again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from New York that the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from New York as amended were vacated.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Chair please restate the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New York as amended by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Chair state the substance of the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The \$10 million amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Vote.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senate agrees to the amendment as amended, that is what it will be.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, may I say that I think the duties of the conference committee will be made much simpler if the vote is practically unanimous in the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, that is what I hope it will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

(At this point Mr. BYRD of Virginia took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Aiken	Goodell	Mundt
Allott	Gore	Murphy
Anderson	Gravel	Muskie
Bayh	Griffin	Nelson
Bellmon	Gurney	Packwood
Bennett	Hansen	Pastore
Bible	Harris	Pearson
Boggs	Hart	Pell
Brooke	Hartke	Percy
Burdick	Hatfield	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Hollings	Randolph
Cannon	Hruska	Ribicoff
Case	Hughes	Saxbe
Church	Inouye	Schweiker
Cook	Jackson	Scott
Cooper	Javits	Smith
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Dirksen	Kennedy	Stevens
Dodd	Magnuson	Symington
Dole	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dominick	Mathias	Tower
Eagleton	McCarthy	Tydings
Eastland	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McGee	Williams, Del.
Ervin	McGovern	Yarborough
Fannin	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Goldwater	Miller	

NAYS—1

Allen

NOT VOTING—10

Baker	Mondale	Sparkman
Cranston	Montoya	Thurmond
Fong	Moss	
Long	Russell	

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have no intention of detaining the Senate, but before we move to the third reading, I ask unanimous consent that there be a small technical change made in an amendment which was offered by the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) yesterday and ac-

cepted and which was adopted by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the following words in that amendment: "and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted" be deleted and that there be substituted the following words: "including the effect on the limitation as set forth herein."

I have discussed this with the able Senator from Maine, and we are both in agreement that this change in the amendment should be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 11400) was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there is much in this bill for which I would like to vote, and I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia for the manner in which he has handled the appropriations that are in the bill. I am, however, going to vote "nay" on this bill because of the fact that it has two sections which I oppose.

One repealed the control which had been imposed on the number of civilian employees in the Federal Government, which action, in my opinion, was most unwise.

The second places an imaginary ceiling on the amount of expenditures for fiscal 1970, a ceiling which, in my opinion, will have no effect whatsoever as far as controlling expenditures is concerned.

I would not want to be a party to approving something which gives the impression that Congress has done something when, in reality, we have done nothing but approve an expression of good intentions.

The taxpayers should be on notice that as far as the Senate action is concerned there are to be no effective controls on either expenditures or the number of employees that are on the public payroll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, of the many important areas covered by this supplemental appropriations bill, I have a particularly strong interest in that section dealing with the section 235 "homeownership" and section 236 "rental housing" assistance programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The Committee on Appropriations has recommended \$50 million in contract authority for each of these deserving programs. The House allowed \$40 million in each instance. However, I want to urge my distinguished colleagues to follow the Senate committee's recommenda-

tion, and restore the \$10 million authorized for each program, thus bringing their funding levels up to the amounts authorized by the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. I feel that it is vitally important that we do this.

The 1968 act was the end result of almost 2 years of concentrated effort by the Congress to provide the means whereby our Nation's low-income families could have the opportunity to own and rent safe, decent, and adequate housing. The 1968 act created the 235 and 236 assistance programs, and thus this opportunity.

It is especially important that the act recognized, for the first time, the need for some kind of helping hand to those families who aspire to the basic American tradition of homeownership, but because of their limited financial means, cannot bring their hopes into being. Until the enactment of the homeownership assistance program in late 1968, this inherent desire of our low-income families to own their own homes was given little recognition, notwithstanding the many housing programs already on the books. This is why it is so important, in my opinion, that this program be given the chance to demonstrate its full potential.

The new rental housing assistance program, likewise, should be fully tried as an alternative to other low-income multi-family housing programs that have been relative ineffective because of their lack of acceptance and other shortcomings.

But I want to emphasize the very important focus of these two new programs as intended by the Congress. While private investment and the productive efforts of free enterprise are looked to to produce this housing, eligible families are still the beneficiaries of a Government subsidy on their behalf. The justification, and purpose, for this subsidy is clearly stated by the 1968 act's declaration of policy to be to "assist families with incomes so low that they could not otherwise decently house themselves."

In other words, the programs are intended to help deserving families acquire adequate housing in those instances where they cannot do so on their own. There are great numbers of these families in our country today, and for the most part, they are found in those neighborhoods where substandard housing conditions prevail. These are the families that these two new assistance programs should seek out. The programs would be misdirected, and their potential effectiveness diluted, if they are allowed to encompass families capable of paying for their own housing on the private market without outside assistance. I would urge that this be guarded against as the present backlog of applications is weighed against the funds to be made available. To not do so would also disillusion those true low-income families who for the first time are encouraged to believe that their housing needs have been recognized. This we can ill afford.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I intend to cast my vote "No" on the supplemental appropriations bill, and shall take a few minutes to explain my position.

My "No" vote does not indicate disagreement with the programs being funded in this supplemental bill.

It does emphatically indicate my disapproval of the amount of money in the bill.

The United States is now in the throes of one of the greatest inflationary periods in history.

It is faced with one of the most serious money crisis in the 200 years we have been a Nation.

All of us here know this.

People who are far more knowledgeable than I—economists, bankers, business people—some of these are literally scared to death as to what may arise in the weeks and months ahead, because of this money crisis.

Ordinary citizens who may not be aware of the niceties of national and international finance know about inflation. They write me every day about the rising prices of the basic necessities of life—food, shelter, and clothing.

They want something done about it.

That is what the election of 1968 was all about—at least in part.

The issues were three: Vietnam; crime; and, just as large on the domestic scene, money and inflation.

Of course, there is more than one factor in inflation.

But, again, all of us know that, above all, the principal cause of inflation, here and all over the world, has been a free-wheeling, big-spending policy on the part of a government.

For years, under the previous administration, that was the policy.

The new programs, the overall spending schemes of the past administration, were largely triggered and sparked by the White House.

But Congress shared in this overspending also. For not a single dollar of taxpayer money can be spent by the President or the departments without prior approval by Congress in appropriation bills.

It is way past time that we assumed our responsibility, which I submit we have not been doing in recent years.

I do not think we are shouldering our responsibility in this bill.

The House set a figure of \$3,783,212,766.

In the bill we have upped that figure by \$673,596,878.

In the past few days we have further upped this figure an unknown but certainly very considerable sum.

We have also amended the bill to practically do away with any ceiling. What we did yesterday was to put in an elevator-supported ceiling, going up and down as it pleases our will.

If I have learned anything in the 7 years I have been in Congress, it is that appropriations rarely go down; they always go up.

My people in Florida voted, in the 1968 election for the Presidency and the Senate, for responsible spending, for handling their tax money as they would their own.

I cannot vote for this supplemental appropriations bill and carry out my responsibilities to my constituents.

My vote will, therefore, be "No"—again not because I disagree with the programs funded herein but because I

think we are spending too much money, which will further contribute to the fires of inflation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California, (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 45 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Aiken	Fulbright	Miller
Allen	Goldwater	Mundt
Allott	Goodell	Murphy
Anderson	Gore	Muskie
Bayh	Gravel	Nelson
Bellmon	Griffin	Packwood
Bennett	Hansen	Pastore
Bible	Harris	Pearson
Boggs	Hart	Pell
Brooke	Hartke	Percy
Burdick	Hatfield	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Hollings	Randolph
Cannon	Hruska	Ribicoff
Case	Hughes	Saxbe
Church	Inouye	Schweiker
Cook	Jackson	Scott
Cooper	Javits	Smith
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Spong
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Dirksen	Kennedy	Stevens
Dodd	Magnuson	Symington
Dole	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dominick	Mathias	Tower
Eagleton	McCarthy	Tydings
Eastland	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McGovern	Yarborough
Ervin	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Gurney Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—11

Baker	McClellan	Russell
Cranston	Mondale	Sparkman
Fong	Montoya	Thurmond
Long	Moss	

So the bill (H.R. 11400) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Pres-

ident, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized in the engrossment of the Senate amendments to make technical and clerical corrections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank all Members of the Senate for their patience, understanding, cooperation, and courtesy throughout the debate on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I note for the record that the report on the measure just adopted contains 111 pages. In addition, the hearings are nearly 1,400 pages long. I would venture to say that this entire record—as voluminous as it is—was within the quick grasp of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) as he steered this highly important funding bill to overwhelming Senate approval.

I make this point only to suggest that Senator BYRD is unexcelled in his preparation and in his presentation of any measure. His handling of this proposal was no exception. I should point out also that this is only the first year Senator BYRD has served as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals. It hardly needs saying that he performed the task and managed the bill with the same careful diligence and outstanding legislative skill he has applied to all of his numerous accomplishments. I know he would protest that it was only his duty. But may I say that no Member of this body could have better exercised that responsibility.

In my opinion, Bob BYRD is a Senator's Senator. His abiding devotion, his great skill and competence have been an inspiration to many of us. As a leader in this body he has set an example for all. So with the passage of the highly complex and extensive supplemental appropriations measure, Senator BYRD has added another magnificent achievement to his already overflowing record of public service. The Nation is again in his debt.

Also to be commended is the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee who contributed so much to the success of this measure. Others, too, played a vital role. Senator YARBOROUGH, Senator PELL, and Senator PROUTY are especially to be thanked for their successful efforts in behalf of our education programs. Senator JAVITS and Senator

MAGNUSON are similarly to be thanked for their contributions to the debate and for urging their own strong and sincere views. In this respect I should also mention the efforts of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS). His contribution, as always, was most enlightening and most constructive.

Finally, the Senate as a whole is to be thanked for the splendid cooperation of the membership in obtaining expeditious and efficient action today on this all-important measure.

RADIO BROADCASTING AGREEMENTS WITH MEXICO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Senate will go into executive session to vote on Executive B, 91st Congress, first session, the Radio Broadcasting Agreements with Mexico.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the yeas and nays on the agreements.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTTOYA), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTTOYA), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 89, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 46 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Alken	Byrd, Va.	Dole
Allen	Byrd, W. Va.	Dominick
Allott	Cannon	Eagleton
Anderson	Case	Eastland
Bayh	Church	Ellender
Bellmon	Cook	Ervin
Bennett	Cooper	Fannin
Bible	Cotton	Fulbright
Boggs	Curtis	Goldwater
Brooke	Dirksen	Goodell
Burdick	Dodd	Gore

Gravel	Mansfield
Griffin	Mathias
Gurney	McCarthy
Hansen	McGee
Harris	McGovern
Hart	McIntyre
Hartke	Metcalf
Hatfield	Miller
Holland	Mundt
Hollings	Murphy
Hruska	Muskie
Hughes	Nelson
Inouye	Packwood
Jackson	Pastore
Javits	Pearson
Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Jordan, Idaho	Percy
Kennedy	Prouty
Magnuson	Proxmire

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—11

Baker	McClellan	Russell
Cranston	Mondale	Sparkman
Fong	Montoya	Thurmond
Long	Moss	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of legislative business.

NATIONAL COMMITMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 118, Senate Resolution 85.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 85) expressing the sense of the Senate relative to commitments to foreign powers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished chairman of the committee will allow me, I should like to make a preliminary statement which I hope will set the tone of the debate which is about to ensue and which will continue for the remainder of this week and into next week as well.

The Senate is about to begin consideration of the national commitments resolution. In the discussion of this measure, it is to be hoped that Senators will forget the center aisle. The question is not partisan; it is not even bipartisan. It is one of all-Senate concern which goes to the nature of the constitutional responsibilities of this body.

I hope, too, that this resolution will not be the occasion for the conduct of postmortems on past policies. What we might have done differently a few months ago, a year ago, a decade ago, is not at issue. This resolution is pointed not to yesterday but to the pattern of foreign relations which has emerged today and to the issues which will be upon us tomorrow.

In suggesting that recriminations over the past be eschewed, the leadership is not presuming to arrange in advance the form of discussion for the National Commitments resolution. Senators, of course,

may choose to say whatever they wish and whenever they wish to say it on this subject as on any other. I would point out, however, that there has been an unusual availability of floor time this year. In scheduling future sessions, the leadership would be delighted to try to accommodate Members who may wish to go into other matters at length, whether the question is Vietnam, Western Europe, Latin America, or some other.

Insofar as this resolution is concerned, however, it is to be hoped that the discussion will focus on national commitments. What is involved is not what this administration or its predecessors may have done in the past. What is involved is a view of the responsibilities of the Senate in foreign affairs, now and in the future. What is involved is how obscure national commitments can lead from one step to another and eventually to tens of billions of dollars of cost and the tragic loss of lives in armed conflict. How can the Senate, working not against but with the President, see to it that these myriad commitments stem from a contemporary concept of national interest and international realities? How can we—together with the President—see to it that these commitments are useful tools for the peace of the Nation today rather than cumulative anachronisms which are rooted in the inertia of administrative practices? What can the Senate do, in short, as an elected and constitutionally responsible body, to work with an elected President—to assert the effective control of the people of this Nation over the foreign policies of this Nation? That is the essential subject of this resolution. It is a subject eminently worthy of the Senate's consideration. It is a subject which should engage the principal attention of the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I fully concur in the sentiment expressed by the distinguished majority leader. On those occasions when I have had opportunity to discuss Senate Resolution 85, I have constantly and emphatically counseled that it not be approached in a partisan or bipartisan manner and that the center aisle, as the majority leader has so well expressed it, not be taken into consideration when the resolution is considered.

This matter does involve the welfare of the country; and when I say that, we are not unmindful of the fact that by neither a sense of the Senate resolution nor a statute can the constitutional powers of the President be impaired. Notwithstanding all that, it will be very useful to consider the resolution.

Now, there have been before the Committee on Foreign Relations at least three resolutions in the 90th Congress and in the present Congress. I think one was Senate Resolution 115, one was Senate Resolution 187, and this one is Senate Resolution 85. Those resolutions differed somewhat, and I was not too happy about the text of the present resolution. That is why we had a party conference this morning, only for the purpose of having an informative discussion among the Members in the hope that we could agree on some kind of language that would have appeal for everybody.

I felt free, therefore, to discuss this matter with the majority leader this noon, and also with others. I trust that there will be extended debate on the subject—not too extended, but long enough for this story to get to the attention of the country.

So I concur with the majority leader that this matter should be approached at a high level, since the country is involved.

THE ABM SYSTEM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post is an article bearing the headline "Hill Unit Backs Further Tests of ABM 'Brain.'" The story states, in effect, that a majority of the Research and Development Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee had recommended that the ABM be approved only in a very limited way.

In order to keep the record straight—and that is the only reason why I bring up this matter—the subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), rendered a very fine service; but they did not make any report or recommendation at all so far as the ABM or any phase of it is concerned. I will read a few sentences from the unclassified portion of the subcommittee report. First:

The subcommittee itself did not deal directly with the Safeguard ABM system.

The next paragraph begins—

The chairman of the subcommittee has proposed an alternative to the Safeguard ABM proposal.

The next paragraph:

The chairman of the subcommittee contends—

And so forth.

Further the report reads—

The chairman maintains that this alternative would save hundreds of million of dollars . . . [and] The chairman contends that his proposal would save billions of dollars in misspent funds. . . .

These are references to the position of the Senator from New Hampshire. They utilize his position. I know that the Senator from New Hampshire is in no way responsible for the story that appeared in the newspaper.

Three members of the subcommittee joined in the following statement in the report:

The undersigned recommend that when you bring the matter of the Safeguard ABM before the committee in mark-up, that the alternative suggested by the Subcommittee Chairman be considered among the suggestions which may come before the committee at that time.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished chairman that the action last Monday in the meeting of the ad hoc subcommittee, of which the chairman was good enough to name me chairman, was to the effect that three members of that subcommittee agree that at the appropriate time on the agenda of our full committee discussion on the military budget, that the full committee would give ample opportunity for the presentation of alternatives to the Safeguard system.

It is unfortunate that this article appeared. I do not know how these stories which are so incorrectly stated get in the newspapers.

Having served on this committee for 5 years, I understand the subcommittee is an arm of the full committee, and I understand why we must maintain security within our committee. What the chairman of the committee has said is accurate, and I endorse what he has said.

I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I understand. We are marking up the bill, and we will get to this matter in time. This is a very large bill.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so that I may make a comment with respect to this matter?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am so pleased that the chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee have raised this matter.

I notice that there is a story on the UPI wire so I sincerely hope, as a member of that subcommittee, that we can do all that is possible to clarify this situation. It is unfortunate that this item came out.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

S. 2457—INTRODUCTION OF THE KIDNEY DISEASE TREATMENT AND PREVENTION ACT OF 1969

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a comprehensive approach to kidney and kidney-related diseases. My bill, which has the endorsement of the National Kidney Foundation, proposes to establish cooperative and community centers for the treatment of people with kidney diseases, training of personnel, and the establishment of the nationwide prevention program.

Mr. President, each year, about 8 million Americans are afflicted with kidney diseases. Diseases of the kidneys, and diseases affecting these organs, rank among the major ailments which undermine or destroy good health. As the fifth leading cause of death in this country, the insidious nature of kidney diseases is reflected in the fact that many people who harbor infectious organisms in their urinary tract will have no warning of their disease until kidney damage is beyond repair. Of the nearly 8 million new victims each year, about 2,800,000 suffer hypertensive renal cardiovascular diseases causing 35 percent of deaths from kidney disease; about 2 million suffer infectious diseases causing 18 percent of deaths; and, about 3 million suffer other diseases such as hypersensitivity, calculi, urinary abnormalities, and others causing 26 percent of the deaths.

In terms of indirect costs of mortality—lost future income—kidney disease is the highest ranking killer, costing the country \$1,500 million annually. Additionally, more than \$1 billion has to be spent annually for hospital and nursing home care, professional services and drugs. Surprisingly, this exceeds the annual medical services costs for maternity care, or all forms of cancer.

It is heartbreaking to note that an estimated 8,000 Americans will die in 1969 who might otherwise have been saved if we had addressed ourselves at an earlier date to the problems of kidney disease. The 8,000 Americans that I speak of are those patients who doctors have determined are ideal candidates for treatment with the artificial kidney machine or transplantation.

Mr. President, we must address ourselves to this problem now. I hope that the distinguished chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Mr. YARBOROUGH, will call for early hearings on this bill.

I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD at this point an article that appeared in the Washington Post just last Sunday entitled, "Artificial Kidney Puzzle: Who Lives? Who Dies?" I further request that the text of the bill be printed preceding the newspaper article.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2457), to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to certain non-Federal institutions, agencies, and organizations for the establishment and operation of cooperative community programs for patients with kidney disease and for the conduct of training related to such programs, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2457

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Kidney Disease Treatment and Prevention Act of 1969."

SEC. 2. Part B of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"ESTABLISHMENT AND OPERATION OF COOPERATIVE AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS FOR THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF KIDNEY DISEASE

"SEC. 319. (a) It is the purpose of this section to provide financial support through grants to public and other nonprofit schools of medicine, hospitals, agencies, and institutions to assist in the establishment and operation of cooperative and community prevention and treatment programs for patients with kidney diseases and for training related to such programs.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sums of \$12,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; and \$20,000,000 for each succeeding fiscal year until and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974 to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this section and section 321 of this Act.

"(c) The Secretary shall, after consultation with the National Advisory Committee on Kidney Disease Programs (established pursuant to section 321 of this title), prescribe general regulations and guidelines concerning (1) eligibility of public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations for grants under this section, (2) determination of costs with respect to which such grants may be made, (3) the terms and conditions under which such grants will be made, and (4) the assurance that all grants are coordinated with any existing regional

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued June 25, 1969
For actions of June 24, 1969
91-st 1st No. 104

CONTENTS

Appalachia.....1	Foreign affairs.....25	Pollution.....7
Appropriations.....1,20,50	Foreign trade.....12,31	Poultry.....8
Budgeting.....35	Great Plains.....16	Poverty.....32
Census.....11	Hot dogs.....8	Property.....48
Cigarette labeling....9,34	Hunger.....26	Reclamation.....42
Civil defense.....29	Inflation.....22,28	Research.....5,19
Claims.....15	Interest rates.....4	Retirement.....1
Clean air.....7	Intergovernmental	River compact.....18
Conservation...16,17,41,42	cooperation.....45	Rural areas.....49
Contracts.....36	Lands.....42	Taxation.....3,10,21
Dairy.....30	Legislative program....13	Tobacco.....9
Disaster relief.....1	Manpower.....2	Veterans' benefits....23
Employment.....49	Marketing.....47	Water pollution.....38
Environmental quality...39	Meat imports.....46	Wilderness.....6
Farm training.....23	Mexican-Americans.....24	Wildlife.....37
Federal aid.....45	PPB system.....35	Youth corps.....17
Food irradiation.....5	Personnel.....2,44	
Food stamps.....14,26,40	Pesticides.....27,33,43	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed measure to increase food stamp authorization. House passed continuing appropriation bill. Senate committee reported Great Plains conservation bill. Senate committee reported bill to establish youth conservation program in USDA and Interior. House subcommittee approved Calif. wilderness bills. Sen. Scott et al introduced and Sen. Scott discussed bill to extend food stamp program to elderly. Sen. Muskie introduced and discussed intergovernmental cooperation bill. Rep. Nichols introduced and discussed meat import control bill.

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 790, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1970 (pp. H5080-89). The bill was reported earlier by the Appropriation Committee (H. Rept. 91-324)(p. H5203). Rep. Mahon quoted from the report: "The time period covered by the accompanying resolution is limited to the four-month period, July 1--October 31, 1969" (p. H5089).

Passed, 388-7, with amendments H. R. 12307, the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill, 1970 (pp. H5110-55). This bill includes funds for Appalachian regional development and disaster relief programs. The committee report states:

"Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.--The bill contains the budget request of \$73,000,000 for payment to the civil service retirement and disability fund. This amount is necessary to cover the cost of certain increased benefits for retired employees and is required by law.

"The Committee again calls attention to the fact that the deficit in the civil service retirement and disability fund continues to increase. The deficiency is estimated at \$57,674,399,000 at June 30, 1969, and the fund will be paying out more than it is taking in by 1975 unless sound financing is provided soon. A bill has been reported to the House by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee relative to the matter, and the Committee urges that action be taken to provide for the necessary sound financing at the earliest opportunity."

H. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969. Senate conferees have been appointed. p. H5155

2. MANPOWER. Received from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee a report, "Improved Manpower Management in the Federal Government--Examples for the Period July--December 1969" (H. Rept. 91-323). p. H5203
3. TAXATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 12290, to continue the income tax surcharge and the excise taxes on automobiles and communication services for temporary periods, to terminate the investment credit, to provide a low-income allowance for individuals. p. H5203
4. INTEREST RATES. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 123, to extend the time for making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. H5089
Rep. Patman inserted a letter and a resolution from the Cleveland AFL-CIO "deploring the increase in the interest rate." pp. H5197-8
405-3,
5. RESEARCH. Passed without amendment H. R. 12167, the Atomic Energy Commission authorization bill. The bill includes funds for the food irradiation program. pp. H5089-110
6. WILDERNESS. A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 850, amended, to designate the Desolation Wilderness, Eldorado National Forest, Calif., and H. R. 3687, amended, to designate the Ventana Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, Calif. p. D546

McCulloch	Pike	Stafford
McDade	Pirnie	Staggers
McDonald,	Poage	Stanton
Mich.	Podell	Steed
McTwen	Poff	Steiger, Ariz.
McFall	Pollock	Steiger, Wis.
McKinnally	Preyer, N.C.	Stephens
McMillan	Price, Ill.	Stokes
MacGregor	Price, Tex.	Stratton
Madden	Pucinski	Stubblefield
Mahon	Quie	Stuckey
Mailliard	Quillen	Sullivan
Mann	Randall	Symington
Marsh	Rees	Taft
Martin	Reid, Ill.	Talcott
Mathias	Reid, N.Y.	Taylor
Matsunaga	Reifel	Teague, Calif.
May	Reuss	Teague, Tex.
Mayne	Rhodes	Thompson, Ga.
Meeds	Riegle	Thomson, Wis.
Meskill	Rivers	Tiernan
Michel	Roberts	Tunney
Mikva	Robison	Udall
Miller, Calif.	Rodino	Ullman
Miller, Ohio	Rogers, Colo.	Utt
Minish	Rogers, Fla.	Vander Jagt
Mink	Ronan	Vanik
Minshall	Rooney, N.Y.	Vigorito
Mize	Rooney, Pa.	Waggonner
Mizell	Rosenthal	Waldie
Mollohan	Rostenkowski	Wampler
Monagan	Roth	Watkins
Montgomery	Roudebush	Watson
Moorhead	Ruppe	Watts
Morgan	Ruth	Weicker
Morse	Ryan	Whalen
Moss	St Germain	Whalley
Murphy, Ill.	St. Onge	White
Myers	Sandman	Whitehurst
Natcher	Satterfield	Whitten
Nelsen	Schadeberg	Widnall
Nichols	Scherle	Wiggins
Nix	Scheuer	Williams
Obey	Schneebeli	Wilson, Bob
O'Konski	Schwengel	Wilson,
Olsen	Scott	Charles H.
O'Neal, Ga.	Sebelius	Wold
O'Neill, Mass.	Shipley	Wright
Ottinger	Shriver	Wyatt
Passman	Sikes	Wydler
Patman	Sisk	Wyllie
Patten	Skubitz	Wyman
Pelly	Slack	Yates
Pepper	Smith, Calif.	Yatron
Perkins	Smith, Iowa	Zablocki
Pettis	Smith, N.Y.	Zion
Philbin	Snyder	Zwach
Pickle	Springer	

NAYS—6

Brinkley	Gross	Rarick
Griffin	Hagan	Saylor

NOT VOTING—37

Blackburn	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hastings	Nedzi
Burton, Utah	Hathaway	O'Hara
Cahill	Hawkins	Powell
Carey	Hays	Pryor, Ark.
Chisholm	Hébert	Purcell
Esch	Kirwan	Railsback
Fallon	Lennon	Roybal
Flynt	Macdonald,	Thompson, N.J.
Ford,	Mass.	Van Deerlin
William D.	Mills	Winn
Gallagher	Morton	Wolff
Garmatz	Mosher	Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Morton.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Mills with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Mosher.
 Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Railsback.
 Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Blackburn.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Winn.
 Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Lennon.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Rarick.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Roybal.
 Mr. Nedzi with Mrs. Chisholm.
 Mr. Flynt with Mr. Purcell.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Murphy of New York.
 Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Young.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.
 Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Van Deerlin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and to include tables, charts and other printed facts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11400, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, ROONEY of New York, EVINS of Tennessee, NATCHER, FLOOD, BOW, JONAS, CEDERBERG, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the remainder of this week, and any other information concerning the tax bill or other matters at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman, H.R. 12290, the surcharge extension bill will be put over until a later date. We will go on with the program as previously announced with that one exception.

Tomorrow we will consider H.R. 7906, the Interstate Taxation Act.

Mr. Speaker, I must advise the House that it may be necessary to meet later in the week due to conference reports or other resolutions which we might have to consider.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if it is anticipated that we will meet Thursday?

Mr. ALBERT. We will meet on Thursday.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. But because of the funeral services for our former colleague there will be no legislative bus-

iness on Thursday, but possibly we will meet on Friday?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I know that the distinguished majority leader was as disappointed as I was for the reasons that we could not consider the Surtax Extension and Investment Credit Repeal Act.

Could the distinguished majority leader give us any guidance as to that? I have been asked many times in the past three-quarters of an hour when the bill will come up.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished gentleman. We want to discuss this matter with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) before we make any definitive statement of the date when the matter might be called up.

We can say for the benefit of Members of the House that it will not be called up next week.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I know from conversation with the distinguished majority leader that the chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) did ask that it be put over for good and valid reasons so far as he is concerned. But I know the gentleman from Oklahoma shares my feeling that it is important to pass the tax bill, and I know he will program it and schedule it as quickly as possible because we as a nation cannot afford to have the potential ill effects in the economy if this matter does not come to the floor of the House and does not get the approval of the House.

There are many, many elements both at home and abroad that are concerned about any lack of action on the part of the Congress in considering this bill.

Mr. ALBERT. I would say to the distinguished gentleman that there is no reason for any fear that this matter will not be brought up or that this is a postponement which indicates that there is opposition to the bill from the standpoint of the leadership. We intend to program this matter when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is ready to bring it to the floor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Will somebody offer some explanation or suggestion as to why this bill is not coming up tomorrow?

I understand a rule has been granted and this legislation expires June 30. Those who are seriously in doubt about wanting to extend this legislation might want to know why we are waiting until after the Fourth of July.

Is anybody prepared to give us some explanation? What happens after the first of July when the surtax expires? I have been hearing statements by Mr.

Stans and various others about the great catastrophe that will sweep the country if this legislation is not extended. What happens on the first of July? Is somebody prepared to tell us?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. This matter, as I indicated before, has been put over at the request of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am sure the leadership of this House wants to call this legislation up and the leadership is most cooperative. I know the leadership is doing everything it can to bring this matter up. But I am somewhat intrigued by the machinations of the Committee on Ways and Means in now putting this over.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps it is that they want you to enjoy your independence on Independence Day.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is, independence from the surtax—I presume that is what the gentleman means.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois, I have consulted with the leadership and I believe they share my view and my belief that this is a matter of the highest priority. They are concerned about repercussions that might take place if there is any failure on the part of the Congress to act affirmatively. I just hope and trust that our friends at home and those abroad will not misconstrue this, what I hope is, only a temporary delay. I hope there are no adverse economic repercussions by the fact that we are not acting expeditiously. I believe very strongly that the legislation must be approved and it would, I think, be disastrous if it was not enacted in due course as quickly as possible.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. There is no reason for anyone to have any concern along the lines expressed by the gentleman in his statement just now.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the distinguished majority leader. I have no doubt that the leadership will not call up this legislation. Of course they will call it up. I think the leadership is committed to that. But I wonder if someone in the House is prepared to speculate on whether or not this delay on this very urgent matter that we have heard drums beating about here now for some time does not indicate that perhaps the votes are just not there. The fact remains there are many who are very seriously concerned about continuing this tax program for a whole year, when last October all over this country there were promises that there was not going to be an extension of the surtax. I remember peo-

ple coming into my district and saying, "You are not going to have a continuation of the surtax if certain things happen on election day?" So I wonder if this delay is perhaps being caused by reason of the fact that the votes just are not there.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

WAKE UP, AMERICA

(Mr. HALEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the vast publicity that has been given to disorder and violence on the Nation's campuses, the daily reporting in newspapers, on television, and radio, emphasis is constantly given to the misguided youth who have disrupted the educational processes at many of our universities and colleges and little attention is given to those young Americans who work diligently for the betterment of our Nation.

Recently the Winter Haven Daily News-Chief, one of the fine newspapers of the State of Florida, featured as an editorial excerpts from an excellent article by Tom Donnelly, executive vice president of the U.S. Jaycees.

Certainly the members of Mr. Donnelly's organization have exemplified the finest in service to the enrichment of their communities, States, and Nation. Mr. Donnelly expresses his own awareness to the fact that the people of our Nation must wake up to the forces that work among us that would destroy our institutions. His example is the turmoil on our campuses, where misdirected and rebellious young people are playing into the hands of those who would bring about complete chaos and rebellion in the United States.

We must remember that free education will be lost if college administrators and trustees surrender to radical dissenters. Most of all we must remember that a free society cannot survive if such lawlessness is allowed to continue. It is time we restore law and order in every area. It is time the people of the Nation heeded the words of Mr. Donnelly and other clear-thinking Americans. The excerpts from Mr. Donnelly's article follow:

WAKE UP, AMERICA

Wake up, America—before it's too late!

Our nation is being burned down around our ears, and we sit back and watch, and capitulate to the torch bearers. American youth—terribly misguided and misled—are trying to "restructure" the country that has given them more than any other nation on this earth could.

Personally, I'm sympathetic with a number of the student demands for more constructive involvement in campus affairs. There are grievances in many cases that should be investigated and corrected. I'm glad that the U.S. Jaycees can present both sides of the picture.

One problem itself has grown to the point where the television screen recently reported the incident at Cornell—a group of Negro students marching out of the administration building they had occupied, by armed force. They looked like a band of guerrilla fighters, rather than students interested in an education. And even more sickening was what

happened the next day—the complete capitulation, and that's all it could be called, to their every demand by the Cornell administration. Am I crazy, or is that anarchy of the highest degree?

Here at U.S. Jaycee headquarters we have in our employ many people, with many different political views . . . the extreme liberal, the conservative, the moderate. In recent discussion, everyone seemed to agree that something must be done—a halt must be called, now!

Anyone who thinks that the SDS—the chief cause of all the trouble in all the campuses across the nation—is not heavily membered with avowed young Communists . . . is living in a dream world. Read the papers, the magazines, watch the newscasts, talk with concerned students. It's there—plain as day! We are in the growing stages of a revolution that could sweep this nation into chaos just as sure as Mao is a Chinaman.

I'm certainly not an alarmist, a Bircher, or a Racist . . . I'm merely a political moderate who is fast becoming a frightened American—frightened for the future of this great country.

Let's get tough with these young punks! We can either surrender every institution of higher learning in the nation to them, or we can begin showing them they don't rule our world—not yet!

THE 1970 CENSUS

(Mr. QUILLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over the 1970 census boils down to a simple question of values: Is it more important to tabulate an accurate head count than to ascertain the number of color television sets in the United States?

Unquestionably, both of these objectives cannot be attained in the 1970 census as it now stands. And there is some question if either of them can be, when we consider the great proportion of the population which will ignore the census questionnaires or willingly accept the penalties rather than be subjected to another Government intrusion into their personal and private lives.

I introduced legislation in June 1968, and again in January of this year which would eliminate the criminal penalties for failure to answer personal questions on the 1970 census and reduce the number of mandatory answers.

I am not only opposed to the criminal penalties of a \$100 fine and 60 days imprisonment attached to the subjects on the questionnaire. I strongly believe the nature and number of questions constitute an invasion of privacy.

That a Government agency should require the American people to reveal information that is strictly personal and private seems to me to be outrageous and a burden to the public.

Does a Government agency have the right to inquire of a man or woman how many times they have been married, or how the first marriage ended? Further, do we really need to know the answers to all the foolish questions which in no way relate to the number of people in this country?

I fail to see the justification for such items listed on the questionnaire as

July 8, 1969

RESEARCH. S. 1857, to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81-507, as amended, was passed over. p. S7652

TAXATION. Sen. Long inserted his statement before the Finance Committee, with regard to the proposed extension of the surtax, urging that "Senators identify their tax reform proposals to us by July 18 so that the Committee on Finance can proceed with the ordinary processing of intended tax reform." pp. S7674-75
Sen. Hartke stated the surtax "has directly contributed to a whole cycle of inflationary price raises" and inserted a supporting letter. pp. S7692-93

FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Eagleton stated that he and others had urged the President "not to relegate the critically important function of negotiating foreign trade agreements to the Department of Commerce, but rather to keep the Office of Special Trade Representative in the White House" and that he feels "very strongly that the President should order the Office of Special Trade Representative to undertake public hearings at which information can be freely exchanged on the scope and ramifications of any new textile arrangement, prior to the time that arrangements are made for any negotiations." pp. S7677-9

Sen. Smith inserted a Maine Legislature resolution urging action to "promptly restrain the importation of foreign footwear and to provide adequate safeguards which will protect our domestic shoe industry and the citizens it employs." p. S7700

CONSERVATION. Received from the Calif. Legislature a resolution memorializing the President and the Congress to change existing laws regulating grants for soil conservation purposes to include recreation as a major beneficial use. p. S7679

RECREATION. Sen. Jackson commended the Bureau of Land Management on its booklet, "Room to Roam," a recreation guide to the public lands. p. S7693

WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Moss spoke in support of a report made 5 years ago by the special Subcommittee on Western Water Development on the concept of constructing "a gigantic project to divert water from Alaska and northern Canada to Canada's prairie Provinces and the United States" and inserted a letter on the subject. pp. S7696-97

HUNGER. Sen. Hatfield inserted an editorial, "Malnutrition--Here?" which he stated pointed out the connection between unemployment and malnutrition. pp. S7696-7

LIBRARIES. Sen. Yarborough inserted an editorial, "Federal Library Program Essential," which "points out the Nation's libraries are an important and vital element in our national education system." pp. S7699-700

HOUSE

13. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969 (H. Rept. 91-356) (pp. H5620-3). On items for this Department the conferees agreed to the Senate figures shown in the table which is attached to Digest No. 96. The conferees concurred in the Senate amendment repealing Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (personnel limitation). The conferees announced that they will propose a substitute for the over-all ceiling on Government outlays.
Conferees were appointed on H. R. 11582, Treasury-Post Office, Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies appropriation bill for 1970. p. H5623
14. APPALACHIA; RESEARCH. The Rules Committee reported resolutions for consideration of H. R. 4018, a bill to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and H. R. 10878, a bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation. p. H5727
15. AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE. Agreed that for the remainder of this Congress, the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of 24 members; and elected Rep. John Melcher, Mont., to the Agriculture Committee. p. H5624
16. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE. Rep. Gerald Ford commended the President's proposals to expand and improve the unemployment insurance system. pp. H5626-7
Received from the Labor Dept. a proposed bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program; to Ways and Means Committee. p. H5726
17. DISASTER RELIEF. Agreed to a resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6508, the Calif. disaster relief bill. The resolution provides that it shall be in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. pp. H5631-2
18. BONDS; INTEREST RATES. Rep. Michel favored the President's proposal to increase the interest on U. S. savings bonds. pp. H5687-8
19. GERM WARFARE. Rep. McCarthy inserted Secretary General U Thant's report on chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and the effects of their possible use. pp. H5688-713
20. CIGARETTE ADVERTISING. Rep. Moss inserted a Calif. Senate resolution which would prohibit cigarette advertising in Calif. pp. H5714-6
21. EXTENSION SERVICE. Rep. Horton commended cooperative extension services and inserted letters from two home economists describing programs. pp. H5719-20
22. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Morse inserted comments of Deputy Asst. Secretary of State for Latin America Culbertson, "What We Have Learned In 20 Years of Technical Assistance." pp. H5720-2

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1969

JULY 8, 1969.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the committee of conference,
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11400]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 10, 12, 15, 17, 24, 41, 64, 78, and 81.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, and 89, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,450,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,850,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$45,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$45,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

For grants and loans for nonprofit private facilities pursuant to the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457), \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control and coastal emergencies", \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$265,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$170,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16, 27, 29, 31, 33, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 87, 90, 91, and 92.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD CEDERBERG,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$21,500,000 for "Military personnel, Navy," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$146,000,000 for "Military personnel, Air Force," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$115,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes language for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps," proposed by the Senate providing for \$8,910,000 to be derived by transfer.

TITLE II

CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate provision of \$4,000,000 for "Soil Conservation Service, flood prevention," for emergency flood prevention measures.

CHAPTER II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$5,450,000 for "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps," instead of \$6,400,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide for \$500,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps," to be derived by transfer.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide \$1,500,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard," to be derived by transfer.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide \$2,000,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard," to be derived by transfer.

Amendment No. 9: Strikes language proposed by the House.

CHAPTER III—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 10: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$18,736,000 in Federal funds for "Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay".

Amendment No. 11: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment extending the availability of funds under "Public safety" for the Department of Corrections until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 12: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$18,736,000 for "Capital outlay" for the District's share to initiate construction of the basic subway system.

CHAPTER IV—FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that the \$2,700,000 for "Assistance to Refugees in the United States" shall be derived by transfer instead of by direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$160,000,000 for "Subscription to the International Development Association" as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$500,000 for the Office of Emergency Preparedness for "Salaries and expenses, telecommunications," as proposed by the House instead of \$777,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to make \$100,000 of the funds provided for the Federal Trade Commission available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 17: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize the National Science Foundation to purchase one aircraft.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$2,850,000 for the Selective Service System instead of \$2,573,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,139,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$276,600,000 for the Veterans' Administration for "Compensation and pensions" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$179,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$89,200,000 for the Veterans' Administration for "Readjustment benefits" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$53,800,000 for the Veterans' Administration for "Medical care" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$46,189,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23: Authorize an increase of \$45,000,000 for annual contract authorization for homeownership assistance instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize \$45,000,000 for rental housing assistance instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes item proposed by the Senate to appropriate an additional \$1,000,000 for "Fair housing program."

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$2,781,000 for "Bureau of Indian Affairs, education and welfare services," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$2,700,000 for "Bureau of Indian Affairs, resources management," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,769,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment inserting language making \$150,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 28: Deletes House language for a repayable advance to the land and water conservation fund in the amount of \$19,000,000.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$950,000 for "Office of Territories, administration of territories," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$2,242,000 for "Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,092,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$750,000 for "Bureau of Mines, health and safety," to remain available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$10,000,000 for the "Helium fund" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment inserting language extending the availability of \$250,000 of the total amount until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$400,000 for "Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$2,366,000 for "National Park Service, management and protection," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,479,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$1,103,000 for "National Park Service, construction," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$24,374,000 for "Forest Service, forest protection and utilization," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,028,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment inserting language which makes \$460,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment inserting language making gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received prior to September 1, 1969, available for matching Federal contributions.

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Amendment No. 40: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment appropriating \$7,500,000 for "Manpower development and training activities, Manpower Administration," instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Amendment No. 41: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$20,280,000 for "Higher educational activities, Office of Education."

Amendment No. 42: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment appropriating \$3,920,000 for "Higher educational activities, Office of Education," instead of \$11,161,000 as proposed by the House and language distributing the \$20,280,000 proposed by the Senate in Amendment No. 41 and will provide that the appropriation shall be for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Educational Facilities Act, as amended.

Amendment No. 43: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that funds appropriated for "Comprehensive health planning and services," Public Health Service, shall remain available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$15,000,000 for "District of Columbia medical facilities," Public Health Service, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates an additional amount of \$21,200,000 to be derived from social security trust funds for "Limitation on salaries and expenses," Social Security Administration.

CHAPTER VIII—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and

concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$30,000 for the beneficiary of a deceased Senator, language relating to the clerk-hire of Senators, and \$126,900 for Senate "Inquiries and investigations".

CHAPTER IX—PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 47: Inserts chapter number and heading.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$25,000,000 for "Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil, Flood control and coastal emergencies," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Inserts heading and appropriates \$45,000,000 for "Atomic Energy Commission, Plant and capital equipment," as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES

Amendment No. 50: Changes chapter number.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$40,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$1,277,000 for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,314,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$101,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 54: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$162,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 55: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$737,000 available until September 30, 1969.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 56: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which increases the amount available for retirement pay of commissioned officers as provided in "Salaries and expenses, Environmental Science Services."

THE JUDICIARY

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$1,948,000 for "Salaries of judges," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,975,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and

concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$205,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 59: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates \$850,000 for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel" for the fiscal year 1968.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates \$850,000 for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel" for fiscal year 1969, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$10,000 available until September 30, 1969.

CHAPTER XI—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Amendment No. 63: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 64: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$2,000,000 to remain available until December 31, 1969, for "Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses".

CHAPTER XII—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 65: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 66: Appropriates \$470,000 for "U.S. Secret Service, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates \$100,000 for "Council of Economic Advisers, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$107,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$147,000 for "National Security Council, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XIII—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendment No. 69: Changes chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 70 and 71: Appropriate \$18,188,688 for claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of \$16,880,812 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates \$2,699,602 for various Senate items.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates \$174,000 for "Senate office buildings" and \$6,500 for "Senate garage" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates \$2,114,000 for "General Accounting Office, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,214,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates \$2,000,000 for "Consumer and Marketing Service, consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates \$265,000,000 for "Military personnel, Army," instead of \$230,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$300,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates \$170,000,000 for "Military personnel, Navy," instead of \$160,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$198,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates \$45,000,000 for "Military personnel, Marine Corps," as proposed by the House instead of \$61,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79: Appropriates \$267,600,000 for "Military personnel, Air Force," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$214,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates \$16,400,000 for "National Guard personnel, Army," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 81: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing for transfer of \$3,600,000 to "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies."

Amendment No. 82: Provides \$1,100,000 for "Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil, general expenses," to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Construction, general," as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 83, 84, 85, and 86: Delete and insert certain language for "Indian health activities" regarding the transfer from reserves pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364 for pay increase costs as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to authorize release of \$4,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364 for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates \$41,000 for "Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$32,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 89: Appropriates \$400,000 for "National Labor Relations Board, salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

Amendment No. 90: Reported in technical disagreement. A motion will be offered to insert a conference substitute for both the House and Senate versions. The Senate struck the House version.

The conference substitute will impose an overall ceiling on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Government during the fiscal year 1970. As agreed to by the conferees, the *initial* ceiling stated in the provision is \$191,900,000,000—or \$1,000,000,000 below

the amount in the House bill and also \$1,000,000,000 below the revised projection of 1970 budget outlays announced by the President on April 12 and summarized in the review of the 1970 budget released April 15, and appearing in the Congressional Record of April 16, at pages E2993-E2996.

The conference agreement retains the House language that would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with the estimated budget outlay effect of specific congressional actions or inactions in appropriation bills or other bills having an impact on the April 15 budgetary proposals. The conferees have added language to this part of the provision to also make it clear that other actions by the Congress would operate to adjust the ceiling in like fashion. These budgetary and other actions would result in adjustments of the ceiling whether initiated by the President or by the Congress.

And language is included to provide that net reductions made through specific congressional actions or inactions in the various spending bills will count toward the aforementioned \$1 billion expenditure reduction rather than being in addition to it.

The conference agreement makes two adjustments to the original House provision. One is the addition, as subsection (b), of a limited lump-sum exemption to the ceiling figure. This exemption would permit the President, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, to adjust the ceiling figure by an aggregate amount not exceeding \$2,000,000,000 in respect to variations in estimates for items enumerated in subsection (b) upon his determination that expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for the enumerated items will vary from the estimates on which the \$192.9 billion April 15 executive budget projection is based. The enumerated items in all instances involve objects and programs for which the budget outlays arise out of appropriations or other authority, or relate to estimated receipts that operate to offset budget outlays, that *do not require current action by the Congress*—in other words, permanent appropriations or other spending authority contained in basic law, or actions or inactions that operate otherwise to determine budget outlays under the unified budget concept.

The other adjustment to the original House provision is the \$1 billion reduction. The House bill made no reduction; it was directed primarily to securing *focus* on and ceiling *control* of all spending, not primarily to expenditure *reduction*.

CONTRAST OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT WITH HOUSE AND SENATE VERSIONS

The House version is explained in considerable detail beginning on page 118 of House Report 91-252. The Senate committee version was modified in some particulars on the floor, but the basic thrust and key features of the Senate version are explained on page 47 of Senate Report 91-228. Briefly:

The House provision was all encompassing; it contained no exemptions. And it did not seek to make a blanket reduction in the projected budget outlay total. The thrust of the House provision was to put the control of *total* spending in the hands of Congress, adjustable *only* by the Congress.

The Senate provision, unlike the House provision, did not put a ceiling on *total* budget outlays. The Senate provision exempted from the ceiling over half of projected expenditures and net lending—about \$111.7 billion on the basis of currently estimated amounts. And the Senate provision would have imposed a reduction of at least \$1,900,000,000 in the nonexempted areas of the budget, that is, against areas involving budget outlays of about \$81.2 billion as projected in the April 15 review. It would, in turn, have fixed a firm statutory ceiling of \$79.3 billion on budget outlays in the nonexempted areas. In the exempted items, budget outlays could rise as high as the requirements were determined to be. The President would have to make the necessary reductions to the extent the Congress, through its budgetary actions during the session, did not achieve the \$1,900,000,000 figure.

The conference agreement would likewise require the President to make any reductions necessary to achieve the \$1,000,000,000 cut to the extent Congress, through its budgetary actions during the session, did not do so.

Since the conference agreement sets a comprehensive ceiling which would be continuously adjustable based on congressional actions or inactions on budgetary proposals whether initiated by the President or by the Congress and whether or not inside or outside the April 15 budget review totals, there is no necessity to exempt any area of the budget that Congress normally acts upon each year. Approval of supplemental appropriations to meet existing unbudgeted requirements would be the basis for a corresponding adjustment in the ceiling on budget outlays.

But the situation is different where additional budget outlays—not contemplated in the April 15 budget review or found practicable within the \$191.9 billion ceiling figure—arise in respect to *programs and items on which Congress does not act annually* to supply the appropriation or other outlay authority. These are mainly the so-called permanent authorizations that each year automatically stem from various basic laws and thus are not acted upon in the annual bills. It is for a limited number of these instances—instances involving generally large sums and where it is difficult to make accurate projections—that the conferees have made provision, in subsection (b), for the President, if he finds it necessary and so notifies Congress, to allow the increased expenditures above the related estimates on which the \$191.9 billion April 15 budget was based. The conference agreement puts a dollar limit of \$2,000,000,000 on how far the President can go in so adjusting the ceiling.

The items in respect to which the Presidential adjusting authority could operate if found necessary are:

On page 16 of the budget:

(1) Items designated "Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds";

(2) The appropriation "National service life insurance (trust fund)" included in the items designated "Veterans' pensions, compensation, and insurance";

(3) The item "Interest"; and

(4) The item "Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)".

Decline of receipts (credited in the budget against expenditures and net lending) derived from—

(1) Sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans' Administration, and the Small Business Administration; and

(2) Leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Subsection (c) of the conference agreement retains the House provision in respect to periodic executive reports on the operation of the ceiling provision.

LIMITATION ON NUMBERS OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Amendment No. 91: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate, repealing section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act which placed limitations on filling of vacancies in certain full-time permanent civilian positions in the Government and on the number of temporary and part-time employees in certain Government agencies.

In section 201 itself, and in subsequent enactments in the last session, Congress exempted from the limitations and restrictions about one-third of the Government's full-time permanent positions and about two-thirds of the Government's temporary and part-time positions.

While section 201 was adopted as part of an economizing measure, the conferees are agreed that its impact is, in some cases, contrary to efforts to economize. The weight of the evidence is clear: It has cost much more than it has saved, not only in cases where dollar losses through operation of the section can be identified and estimated, but also in many other less measurable instances through the introduction of imbalances and inefficiencies into day-to-day administration.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in costly overtime work.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in a large loss of internal revenue collections to the Treasury.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in inefficient utilization of personnel.

Particulars in these respects are cited in House Reports 91-264 and 91-265, on the appropriation bills for the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, and Agriculture, and in Senate Report 91-228 on this second supplemental appropriation bill.

The Committee on Appropriations, because of the costly and impractical consequences of operations under section 201, is embarked on a suspension plan for every agency as the appropriation bills are reported. The House has already suspended section 201 with respect to the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, Agriculture, HUD, and many independent agencies during the fiscal year 1970. The motion to be offered would repeal the section altogether.

Congress will, of course, continue to control Federal employment through the traditional appropriations process by providing or withholding appropriations for salaries.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

Amendment No. 92: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment in order to validate obligations incurred between July 1, 1969, and 5 days following approval of the act.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
E. A. CEDERBERG,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.



House of Representatives

TUESDAY, JULY 8, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. J. Theodore Alam, Irvington United Presbyterian Church, Fremont, Calif., offered the following prayer:

James 1: 5: *If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask God, who gives to all men generously and without reproaching, and it will be given him.*

O God, as we come to Thee this day we thank Thee for this great Nation of ours. We thank Thee that we can have a small part in determining the destiny of that Nation. But when we realize the magnitude of this responsibility we feel very humble in Thy sight, and turn to Thee for Thy divine guidance.

We bow in the shadows of those great men who have gone before.

We are sure that they too felt their need of Thy guiding hand.

We have faith to believe that even as Thou didst direct their decisions Thou wilt help us in ours.

Out of the uncertainty, confusion, and chaos we find in the world today, help us to bring order and harmony to all people.

May the peace of God that passeth all understanding be with us this day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11612. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 11612) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE JULIA EDITH KUNS ASPINALL

(Mr. ROGERS of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I an-

nounce the death of Julia Edith Kuns Aspinall, wife of our beloved Member, the gentleman from Colorado, WAYNE N. ASPINALL.

Mrs. Aspinall died this morning at 8:15. Prayer services will be tomorrow night at 8 p.m. at the Gawler's Funeral Home on Wisconsin Avenue and Harrison Street NW. Services later will be in the State of Colorado.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to express to WAYNE ASPINALL and the members of his family my very sincerest sympathy on this loss. I knew Mrs. Aspinall, and I am certain all of us are sorry to hear of her passing.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished gentleman from Colorado in expressing the sympathy of all of us in the House to our wonderful colleague, WAYNE ASPINALL, who has this day lost his dear wife. We all love WAYNE. He is one of our finest Members, and one of the most competent committee chairmen that I have ever known. Our hearts go out to him and his children in this hour of their great sorrow. May our Heavenly Father comfort them in their grief.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Colorado in mourning the death of such a fine and outstanding lady as the wife of the chairman of our great Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL). I extend to the gentleman and to his family the sympathies of Mrs. Haley and myself.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the passing of the beloved wife of our colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, WAYNE ASPINALL. WAYNE and I came to the Congress in the same Congress on January 3, 1949. Our offices were across the corridor from one another. As a consequence, I became a close personal friend of WAYNE ASPINALL, and our families became well acquainted. We developed a closeness that I have deeply appreciated.

The Aspinall family is one of the very finest and they will miss a wonderful wife and mother.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express to WAYNE and his family the deepest condolences of the Ford family in his hour of grief.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for calling this sad event to the attention of the Members of the House.

Julia Aspinall was one of the loveliest and one of the most gracious women I have ever had the privilege of knowing. She was a close friend who was loved by all of the wives of the members on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—a kind and gracious and thoughtful person who contributed in many, many ways to the Aspinall team and its dedicated representation of the people of Colorado.

She was a wonderful mother. Her children are a living legacy that will enrich their State and the country for many years to come.

My wife joins me in expressing our very deepest sympathy to WAYNE and to the other members of the Aspinall family in their tragic loss.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in mourning the death of this splendid woman, Julia Aspinall.

WAYNE and I came to Congress in the 89th session and in due time Mrs. Aspinall and Mrs. Gross became good friends. Julia Aspinall was a devoted wife and mother. She was completely unpretentious, caring little for the social life of Washington, but rather devoting her time and energy to her husband and her family.

Mrs. Gross and I will greatly miss this good and common friend.

To WAYNE and all members of the family we extend our heartfelt sympathy in this, their time of great sorrow.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to become acquainted with Julia when WAYNE and I attended law school together at the University of Denver in 1922.

Julia has been the right arm to WAYNE ASPINALL. They reared a fine family in the State of Colorado. We who knew Julia loved her.

During the 21 years that WAYNE has represented his district from Colorado, Julia aided and assisted him. We will all miss her in the future. I extend my sympathy to the family.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues in expressing our deep, heartfelt and prayerful sympathy to WAYNE ASPINALL, one of the outstanding Members of this House, and to his family in this, their hour of deep sorrow.

I have known WAYNE and Julie for almost 20 years, since being here in Washington.

A memory uppermost in my recollections is about the role that Mrs. Aspinall played as a warm, cohesive, understanding and compassionate person, raising and holding together a wonderful family; and who sustained her husband over those years in times of difficulty and political stress back home and then during the years of the additional burden that came with the responsibility of the chairmanship of an important committee in developing and yet protecting the vast natural resources of this great Nation.

In recent years the strain showed on the chairman and again this frail and understanding woman was the sustaining force in the family. Then when illness beset this gallant lady, the family in turn assembled and gathered around her to sustain and comfort her in her hour of grave need.

She is gone now, but her love and their love shall live for time to come, in memory of this dear mother and beloved wife.

So I join their many, many friends, from all walks of life, in extending to WAYNE and to his sons and daughter, our deepest sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Speaker of the House (Mr. McCORMACK).

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of Mrs. Aspinall.

We all know the intense love that WAYNE and Mrs. Aspinall had for one another. We all know of the beauty of her life and her wonderful outlook on life. We all appreciated her understanding mind and know that her life was an inspiration for others to follow.

To my dear friend and colleague, WAYNE ASPINALL, I extend my heartfelt sympathy, and to his loved ones, in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in expressing our deep sorrow and our sympathy for the family of our colleague in the passing of Mrs. Wayne Aspinall.

We all knew and loved Julia. As has been so aptly said, there has never been a finer team and a better or finer family than these two. Her contributions to WAYNE, to her church, to her family and friends were limitless.

Mr. Speaker, again I express the sympathy of myself and wife to WAYNE and to his family in this time of sorrow.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in these expressions of sym-

pathy for WAYNE ASPINALL and his family.

The Aspinalls and the Mahons for years have gone to the same church and we have been good friends and neighbors. Mrs. Aspinall was a charming and delightful person. She was a very wonderful woman, warm and kind and thoughtful. Mrs. Mahon and I mourn her passing and join in words of sympathy for Mr. ASPINALL and the surviving family at this sad time.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11400, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the managers on the part of the House ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1969.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 91-356)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11400) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 10, 12, 15, 17, 24, 41, 64, 78, and 81.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 9, 14, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37, 45, 47, 49, 50, 52, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 79, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, and 89, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$45,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

"For grants and loans for nonprofit private facilities pursuant to the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457), \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

"FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

"For an additional amount for 'Flood control and coastal emergencies', \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$265,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$170,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16, 27, 29, 31, 33, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 46, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 87, 90, 91, and 92.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FRANK BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
E. A. CEDERBERG,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Military operations in Southeast Asia

Department of Defense—Military

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$21,500,000 for "Military personnel, Navy" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$146,000,000 for "Military personnel, Air Force" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$115,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes language for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps" proposed by the Senate providing for \$8,910,000 to be derived by transfer.

TITLE II

Chapter I—Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 4: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate provision of \$4,000,000 for "Soil Conservation Service, flood prevention" for emergency flood prevention measures.

Chapter II—Department of Defense—Military

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$5,450,000 for "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps" instead of \$6,400,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide for \$500,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps" to be derived by transfer.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide \$1,500,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard" to be derived by transfer.

Amendment No. 8: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide \$2,000,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard" to be derived by transfer.

Amendment No. 9: Strikes language proposed by the House.

Chapter III—District of Columbia

Amendment No. 10: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$18,736,000 in Federal funds for "Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay".

Amendment No. 11: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment extending the availability of funds under "Public safety" for the Department of Corrections until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 12: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$18,736,000 for "Capital outlay" for the District's share to initiate construction of the basic subway system.

Chapter IV—Foreign operations

Amendment No. 13: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that the \$2,700,000 for "Assistance to Refugees in the United States" shall be derived by transfer instead of by direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$160,000,000 for "Subscription to the International Development Association" as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter V—Independent offices

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates \$500,000 for the Office of Emergency Preparedness for "Salaries and expenses, telecommunications" as proposed by the House instead of \$777,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to make \$100,000 of the funds provided for the Federal Trade Commission available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 17: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize the National Science Foundation to purchase one aircraft.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$2,850,000 for the Selective Service System instead of \$2,573,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,139,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$276,600,000 for the Veterans Administration for "Compensation and pensions" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$179,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$89,200,000 for the Veterans Administration for "Readjustment benefits" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$14,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$53,800,000 for the Veterans Administration for "Medical care" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$46,189,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23: Authorize an increase of \$45,000,000 for annual contract authorization for homeownership assistance instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize \$45,000,000 for rental housing assistance instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24: Deletes item proposed by the Senate to appropriate an additional \$1,000,000 for "Fair housing program."

Chapter VI—Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$2,781,000 for "Bureau of Indian Affairs, education and welfare services" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$2,700,000 for "Bureau of Indian Affairs, resources management" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,769,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment inserting language making \$150,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 28: Deletes House language for a repayable advance to the land and water conservation fund in the amount of \$19,000,000.

Amendment No. 29: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$950,000 for "Office of Territories, administration of territories" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$2,242,000 for "Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,092,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$750,000 for "Bureau of Mines, health and safety", to remain available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$10,000,000 for the "Helium Fund" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment inserting language extending the availability of \$250,000 of the total amount until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates \$400,000 for "Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, construction" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates \$2,366,000 for "National Park Service, management and protection" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,479,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$1,103,000 for "National Park Service, construction" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$24,374,000 for "Forest Service, Forest protection and utilization" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$25,028,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment inserting

language which makes \$460,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 39: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment inserting language making gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received prior to September 1, 1969, available for matching Federal contributions.

Chapter VII—Department of Labor

Amendment No. 40: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment appropriating \$7,500,000 for "Manpower development and training activities, Manpower Administration," instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare

Amendment No. 41: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate \$20,280,000 for "Higher educational activities, Office of Education."

Amendment No. 42: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment appropriating \$3,920,000 for "Higher educational activities, Office of Education" instead of \$11,161,000 as proposed by the House and language distributing the \$20,280,000 proposed by the Senate in Amendment No. 41 and will provide that the appropriation shall be for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Educational Facilities Act, as amended.

Amendment No. 43: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which provides that funds appropriated for "Comprehensive health planning and services", Public Health Service, shall remain available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$15,000,000 for "District of Columbia medical facilities", Public Health Service, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates an additional amount of \$21,200,000 to be derived from social security trust funds for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", Social Security Administration.

Chapter VIII—Legislative branch

Amendment No. 46: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment appropriating \$30,000 for the beneficiary of a deceased Senator, language relating to the clerk-hire of Senators, and \$126,900 for Senate "Inquiries and investigations."

Chapter IX—Public works

Amendment No. 47: Inserts chapter number and heading.

Amendment No. 48: Appropriates \$25,000,000 for "Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil, Flood control and coastal emergencies" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Inserts heading and appropriates \$45,000,000 for "Atomic Energy Commission, Plant and capital equipment" as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter X—Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary and related agencies

Amendment No. 50: Changes chapter number.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$40,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$1,277,000 for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,314,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$101,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 54: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$162,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 55: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$737,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 56: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which increases the amount available for retirement pay of commissioned officers as provided in "Salaries and expenses, Environmental Science Services".

The Judiciary

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$1,948,000 for "Salaries of judges" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,975,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$205,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Amendment No. 59: Inserts heading as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which appropriates \$850,000 for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel" for the fiscal year 1968.

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates \$850,000 for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel" for fiscal year 1969, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which makes \$10,000 available until September 30, 1969.

Chapter XI—Department of Transportation

Amendment No. 63: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 64: Deletes proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$2,000,000 to remain available until December 31, 1969, for "Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses".

Chapter XII—Treasury Department

Amendment No. 65: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 66: Appropriates \$470,000 for "U.S. Secret Service, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate.

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 67: Appropriates \$100,000 for "Council of Economic Advisers, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$107,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 68: Appropriates \$147,000 for "National Security Council, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$200,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter XIII—Claims and Judgments

Amendment No. 69: Changes chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 70 and 71: Appropriate \$18,188,688 for claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of \$16,880,812 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates \$2,699,602 for various Senate items.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates \$174,000 for "Senate office buildings" and \$6,500 for "Senate garage" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates \$2,114,000 for "General Accounting Office, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,214,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates \$2,000,000 for "Consumer and Marketing Service, consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,300,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates \$265,000,000 for "Military personnel, Army", instead of \$230,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$300,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates \$170,000,000 for "Military personnel, Navy", instead of \$160,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$198,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates \$45,000,000 for "Military personnel, Marine Corps", as proposed by the House instead of \$61,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79: Appropriates \$267,600,000 for "Military personnel, Air Force", as proposed by the Senate instead of \$214,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates \$16,400,000 for "National Guard personnel, Army" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 81: Deletes language proposed by the Senate providing for transfer of \$3,600,000 to "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies".

Amendment No. 82: Provides \$1,100,000 for "Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers—Civil, General expenses" to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Construction, general", as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 83, 84, 85, and 86: Delete and insert certain language for "Indian health activities" regarding the transfer from reserves pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364 for pay increase costs as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 87: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate to authorize release of \$4,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of P.L. 90-364 for the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 88: Appropriates \$41,000 for "Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$32,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 89: Appropriates \$400,000 for "National Labor Relations Board, Salaries and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE IV—LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

Amendment No. 90: Reported in technical disagreement. A motion will be offered to insert a conference substitute for both the House and Senate versions. The Senate struck the House version.

The conference substitute will impose an overall ceiling on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the government during the fiscal year 1970. As agreed to by the conferees, the initial ceiling stated in the

provision is \$191,900,000,000—or \$1,000,000,000 below the amount in the House bill and also \$1,000,000,000 below the revised projection of 1970 budget outlays announced by the President on April 12 and summarized in the Review of the 1970 Budget released April 15, and appearing in the Congressional Record of April 16, at pages E2993-2996.

The conference agreement retains the House language that would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with the estimated budget outlay effect or specific congressional actions or inactions in appropriation bills or other bills having an impact on the April 15 budgetary proposals. The conferees have added language to this part of the provision to also make it clear that other actions by the Congress would operate to adjust the ceiling in like fashion. These budgetary and other actions would result in adjustments of the ceiling whether initiated by the President or by the Congress.

And language is included to provide that net reductions made through specific congressional actions or inactions in the various spending bills will count toward the aforementioned \$1 billion expenditure reduction rather than being in addition to it.

The conference agreement makes two adjustments to the original House provision. One is the addition, as subsection (b), of a limited lump-sum exemption to the ceiling figure. This exemption would permit the President after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, to adjust the ceiling figure by an aggregate amount not exceeding \$2,000,000,000 in respect to variations in estimates for items enumerated in subsection (b) upon his determination that expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for the enumerated items will vary from the estimates on which the \$192.9 billion April 15 executive budget projection is based. The enumerated items in all instances involve objects and programs for which the budget outlays arise out of appropriations or other authority, or relate to estimated receipts that operate to offset budget outlays, that do not require current action by the Congress—in other words, permanent appropriations or other spending authority contained in basic law, or actions or inactions that operate otherwise to determine budget outlays under the unified budget concept.

The other adjustment to the original House provision is the \$1 billion reduction. The House bill made no reduction; it was directed primarily to securing focus on and ceiling control of all spending, not primarily to the expenditure reduction.

Contrast of conference agreement with House and Senate versions

The House version is explained in considerable detail beginning on page 118 of H. Report 91-252. The Senate Committee version was modified in some particulars on the floor, but the basic thrust and key features of the Senate version are explained on page 47 of S. Report 91-228. Briefly:

The House Provision was all-encompassing; it contained no exemptions. And it did not seek to make a blanket reduction in the projected budget outlay total.

The thrust of the House provision was to put the control of total spending in the hands of Congress, adjustable only by the Congress.

The Senate provision, unlike the House provision, did not put a ceiling on total budget outlays. The Senate provision exempted from the ceiling over half of projected expenditures and net lending—about \$111.7 billion on the basis of currently estimated amounts. And the Senate provision would have imposed a reduction of at least \$1,900,000,000 in the non-exempted areas of the budget, that is, against areas involving budget outlays of about \$81.2 billion as pro-

jected in the April 15 review. It would, in turn, have fixed a firm statutory ceiling of \$79.3 billion on budget outlays in the non-exempted areas. In the exempted items, budget outlays could rise as high as the requirements were determined to be. The President would have to make the necessary reductions to the extent the Congress, through its budgetary actions during the session, did not achieve the \$1,900,000,000 figure.

The conference agreement would likewise require the President to make any reductions necessary to achieve the \$1,000,000,000 cut to the extent Congress, through its budgetary actions during the session, did not do so.

Since the conference agreement sets a comprehensive ceiling which would be continuously adjustable based on congressional actions or inactions on budgetary proposals whether initiated by the President or by the Congress and whether or not inside or outside the April 15 budget review totals, there is no necessity to exempt any area of the budget that Congress normally acts upon each year. Approval of supplemental appropriations to meet existing unbudgeted requirements would be the basis for a corresponding adjustment in the ceiling on budget outlays.

But the situation is different where additional budget outlays—not contemplated in the April 15 budget review or found practicable within the \$191.9 billion ceiling figure—arise in respect to programs and items on which Congress does not act annually to supply the appropriation or other outlay authority. These are mainly the so-called permanent authorizations that each year automatically stem from various basic laws and thus are not acted upon in the annual bills. It is for a limited number of these instances—instances involving generally large sums and where it is difficult to make accurate projections—that the conferees have made provision, in subsection (b), for the President, if he finds it necessary and so notifies Congress, to allow the increased expenditures above the related estimates on which the \$191.9 billion April 15 budget was based. The conference agreement puts a dollar limit of \$2,000,000,000 on how far the President can go in so adjusting the ceiling.

The items in respect to which the Presidential adjusting authority could operate if found necessary are:

On page 16 of the budget:

(1) items designated "Social security, Medicare, and other social insurance trust funds";

(2) the appropriation "National service life insurance (trust fund)" included in the items designated "Veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance";

(3) the item "Interest"; and

(4) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)".

Decline of receipts (credited in the budget against expenditures and net lending) derived from—

(1) sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans Administration, and the Small Business Administration; and

(2) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Subsection (c) of the conference agreement retains the House provision in respect to periodic executive reports on the operation of the ceiling provision.

Limitation on numbers of civilian employees

Amendment No. 91: Reported in technical disagreement. The Managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate, repealing section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act which placed limitations on filling of vacancies in certain full-

time permanent civilian positions in the government and on the number of temporary and part-time employees in certain government agencies.

In Section 201 itself, and in subsequent enactments in the last session, Congress exempted from the limitations and restrictions about one-third of the government's full-time permanent positions and about two-thirds of the government's temporary and part-time positions.

While Section 201 was adopted as part of an economizing measure, the conferees are agreed that its impact is, in some cases, contrary to efforts to economize. The weight of the evidence is clear: It has cost much more than it has saved, not only in cases where dollar losses through operation of the section can be identified and estimated, but also in many other less measurable instances through the introduction of imbalances and inefficiencies into day-to-day administration.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in costly overtime work.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in a large loss of internal revenue collections to the Treasury.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in inefficient utilization of personnel.

Particulars in these respects are cited in H. Reports 91-264 and 265, on the appropriation bills for the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, and Agriculture, and in S. Report 91-228 on this Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill.

The Committee on Appropriations, because of the costly and impractical consequences of operations under section 201, is embarked on a suspension plan for every agency as the appropriation bills are reported. The House has already suspended Section 201 with respect to the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, Agriculture, HUD, and many independent agencies during the fiscal year 1970. The motion to be offered would repeal the section altogether.

Congress will, of course, continue to control federal employment through the traditional appropriations process by providing or withholding appropriations for salaries.

Availability of funds

Amendment No. 92: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment in order to validate obligations incurred between July 1, 1969 and five days following approval of the Act.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FRANK T. BOW,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
E. A. CEDERBERG,
GLENN R. DAVIS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 11582, TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS, THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11582) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and

agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEED, PASSMAN, ADDABBO, COHELAN, MAHON, CONTE, ROBISON, EDWARDS of Alabama, and Bow.

STATE OF WASHINGTON AND NATION WELCOME WITHDRAWN VIETNAM VETERANS

(Mr. PELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today is a historical day for the State of Washington and for our Nation as the first contingent of our military forces arrives at McChord Air Force Base near Tacoma, Wash., from Vietnam. This is the first group in President Nixon's planned withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam.

This arrival at McChord tonight is a graphic demonstration of the President's concern and commitment to ending this terrible and tragic war, and it is the hope of all of us that the President's schedule for bringing our troops home cannot only continue but move ahead of plans.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, city and State officials will conduct a welcoming ceremony in Seattle Thursday for these returning military men. I have been invited to attend this affair, but the press of legislative business keeps me here in Washington, D.C. Yet, I am sure I speak for all Members of the House when I say that our heartiest welcome goes to these men with our deepest hope that this war can be brought to a swift conclusion and that all our young men can be returned home.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that upon the request of our colleague the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House Joint Resolution 247, relating to the administration of the national park system, and H.R. 471, to hold in trust certain lands for the Pueblo de Taos Indians in New Mexico, scheduled for consideration on Wednesday or the balance of the week, will not be called up this week.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 470) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 470

Resolved, That the remainder of the Ninety-first Congress, the Committee on Agriculture shall be composed of thirty-four members

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 471) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 471

Resolved, That John Melcher, of Montana, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Agriculture.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JOHN H. KNOWLES

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks a controversy has been raging over a well-known doctor from Boston, John H. Knowles. I note that Dr. Knowles is now using the news media to further expound his beliefs. I do not doubt that Dr. Knowles is a good physician, but I do question his knowledge insofar as politics is concerned. He now makes an undignified attack upon President Nixon, and I am constrained at this time to say that I am now sure President Nixon was correct when he rejected Dr. Knowles, because Knowles looks like a fence sitter to me. He is even an expert on Vietnam now; in fact, he is an expert on everything. I suggest he join Mr. Nader and Lauren Bacall, because with the three of them together we will not need a Congress or a President—they would effectually run the Nation at their own whim without regard for ethics or virtue.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT OF VESSELS, ETC., FOR THE COAST GUARD

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4153) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "(13)" and insert "(1)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRENGTHENING THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-135)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The best time to strengthen our unemployment insurance system is during a period of relatively full employment.

The Secretary of Labor is sending to the Congress today proposed legislation to extend unemployment insurance to 4,800,000 workers not now covered; to end the shortsighted restrictions that stand in the way of needed retraining efforts; and to add a Federal program automatically extending the duration of benefits in periods of high unemployment.

There are three principles to be considered as we move to make the unemployment insurance system responsive to our times.

Unemployment insurance is an earned benefit. When a man covered by unemployment insurance is working, the employer pays a tax on his wages to insure against the day when the employee may be between jobs. That insurance is like a mandatory fringe benefit; it is insurance bought in the employee's behalf, and the worker therefore is entitled to the benefits he receives when he is unemployed. Accordingly, there is no demeaning of human dignity, no feeling of being "on the dole," when the insured worker receives benefits due.

Unemployment insurance is one of the foremost examples of creative Federal-State partnership. Although the system was created by Federal law, most decisions about the nature of the program are left to the States, which administer the system with State employees. This makes the system far more flexible and attuned to local needs and special circumstances of local economies.

Unemployment insurance is an economic stabilizer. If, for example the economy were ever to slow and unemployment were to rise, this program automatically would act to sustain personal income. This would help prevent a downturn from gathering momentum resulting from declines in purchasing power. When employment is at a high level, and greater stimulation of consumer demand is unwanted, relatively little money flows into the economy from unemployment insurance.

With these principles in mind, I am making these recommendations for both Federal and State action:

1. We should act together to extend unemployment protection to more employees, including many highly vulnerable to layoffs who are not now covered.

2. The States should make certain that workers throughout the United States receive enough money for a long enough period of time to sustain them while they seek new jobs.

3. We should end the restrictions imposed by almost half the States on payments to unemployed workers undergoing retraining and, instead, follow the lead of those States which encourage retraining.

4. We should better protect the investment made on behalf of the insured by seeing to it that the funds are paid only to those who should receive them.

5. We should increase the responsiveness of the system to major changes in national economic conditions.

6. We should strengthen the financing of the system which presently discriminates against the low-wage worker and the steady employer.

1. PROTECTING MORE EMPLOYEES

Over 57 million workers are protected by unemployment insurance. However, almost 17 million are not covered; more than half of these are employees of State and local governments. The last extension of coverage was enacted during the Eisenhower Administration, when 6 million additional workers were included; there is a clear social need today to cover as many more employees as we can.

I propose that an additional 4.8 million workers be covered by unemployment insurance. These include:

- 1,600,000 workers in small firms with less than four employees;
- 400,000 on large farms employing four or more workers in each of 20 weeks;
- 200,000 in agricultural processing activities;
- 1,800,000 in non-profit organizations;
- 600,000 in State hospitals and universities;
- 200,000 salesmen, delivery tradesmen, and others who are not currently defined as employees.

These 4,800,000 workers are in real need of protection against unemployment. Many of them are low wage workers with little job security and no prospect of termination pay if they are laid off.

The present gaps in coverage work a disproportionate hardship on minority workers, since a higher percentage of the 4,800,000 are nonwhite, compared to the entire labor force.

To cushion the immediate impact of this extension on employers, I recommend that States be permitted to lower the tax rates on newly covered employers until such time as a record of employment experience can be compiled to determine what their true rate should be.

With the passage of this legislation, the majority of those remaining uncovered will be employees of State and local governments. I urge the States and localities to take action, in the light of their local circumstances, to include their own employees in unemployment insurance coverage.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued July 10, 1969
For actions of July 9, 1969
91st 1st No. 113

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1	Flood control.....1	Pollution.....16,24
Census.....21	Food stamps.....33	Population.....18
Clean water.....16,24	Foreign trade.....30	Quarantine station.....8
Conservation.....15,27	Forestry.....27	Recreation.....14,34
Credit.....38	Health benefits.....37	Regional development....13
Daylight time.....5,35	Inflation.....7	Supplemental
Disaster relief.....3	Job corps.....11	appropriations.....1
Economics.....26	Lands.....20	Taxation.....6,25
Education.....4,22	Loans.....38	Timber supply.....27
Employment.....23	Mink imports.....30	Time.....5,35
Environmental	National parks.....14,27	Tobacco.....17
quality.....10,24,36	Packers and stockyards.28	Transportation.....31
Expenditures.....1,25	Personnel.....37	Water resources.....2,29
Farm subsidies.....19	Personnel ceiling.....1	Youth conservation
Fees and charges.....34	Pesticides.....9,12	program.....11

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on second supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee reported environmental quality policy bill. House passed Calif. disaster relief bill.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. The Senate received and both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 11400, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1969, and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. H5733-48, S7786-802

On amendments in disagreement concerning this Department the House concurred in the Senate amendment providing \$4,000,000 for Soil Conservation Service for flood prevention, and the Senate amendment repealing the personnel limitation of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (pp. H5743-44). Both Houses agreed to a conference substitute amendment which would impose an overall ceiling on expenditures and net lending during fiscal year 1970, the initial ceiling in the provision being \$191,900,000,000 (pp. H5744-48, S7794).

The Appropriations committee was granted until Thursday, July 10 to file a report on the Dept. of Interior and related agencies appropriation bill. p. H5732

2. WATER RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. 574, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments (S. Rept. 91-358). p. H5798

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 38, to consent to the upper Niobrara River compact between Wyo. and Nebr. (S. Rept. 91-359). p. H5798

3. DISASTER RELIEF. Passed as reported H. R. 6508, to provide assistance to Calif. for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent storms, floods, and high waters (pp. H5749-57). (See Digest 109 for provisions of the bill as reported.)

4. EDUCATION. The Science and Astronautics Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11542, to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institutional grants to the colleges and universities. p. D604

5. DAYLIGHT TIME. Rep. Miller, Calif., commended a publication which recognizes "the rewards of space research that have become a part of our everyday life." pp. H5760-1

6. TAXATION. Rep. Bucinski suggested that the Senate "move on the surtax and leave tax reform as a separate item." p. H5766

7. INFLATION. Rep. Reuss stated that the war against inflation should be fought by using the credit and cost-push policy as well as the fiscal and monetary policy. pp. H5790-1

8. QUARANTINE STATION. Rep. Purcell announced his intention to schedule hearings on a bill to establish an international livestock quarantine station "as soon as" USDA "can obtain clearance from the Bureau of the Budget to present its views." p. H5792

None of us need be reminded of the Soviet Army's invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 or that of Hungary in 1956, instigated by Moscovs' fears that some extent of deviation from the Kremlin's influence was coming to the surface in those countries.

But more of us do need to be reminded that the Tartars, the Ukrainians, the Latvians, and others within what is known as the U.S.S.R., present an even more tragic scene of subjugation.

I urge President Nixon to issue a declaration of support for these captive peoples on the occasion of the 10th annual Captive Nations Week July 13 to 19.

I believe it will be fitting for all Americans, who feel a sense of tragedy whenever human rights are violated, to join in this recognition of people who have been subjugated by the Soviet Union Government.

BIG BANKS REPORT RECORD PROFITS

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the impact of an 8½ percent prime lending rate has only begun to press on the homebuyer and the consumer-borrower. Even before last month's bite has been fully digested, the banks are already talking about grabbing some more.

This would be bad enough if the banks were hurting profitwise and turned to higher interest rates to solve their problems. Instead, the banks are laughing all the way to the bank with record profits dollarwise, percentagewise, and everywhere. That small outfit known as the J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., showed an 11-percent increase in profits for the second quarter of this year alone. Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy's former bank, Continental Illinois, had a first half net profit of \$29 million, up almost \$3 million from last year for a 10.7-percent increase. Manufacturers Hanover Corp. had a whopping 21-percent increase in profits the first half of this year over the first half of last year.

The New York Times of yesterday reported that the bankers are generally pleased with the profit showings but a bit apprehensive that the reports could provide fuel for controversy in Congress. I can only hope that there are grounds for the apprehensiveness. At this point, the banks seem to have little to worry about—aside from the fact that they might wreck the whole economy in their avarice.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to advise the House that we will add to the program for tomorrow House Resolution 472, creating a select committee to be known as the Committee on the House Restaurant.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

Anderson, III.	Davis, Ga.	Michel
Andrews,	Derwinski	Morton
N. Dak.	Diggs	Mosher
Ashbrook	Edwards, Calif.	O'Neal, Ga.
Aspinall	Fraser	O'Neill, Mass.
Bell, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Ottinger
Berry	Gallagher	Passman
Boggs	Garmatz	Powell
Bolling	Gray	Quillen
Bow	Green, Oreg.	Rosenthal
Button	Green, Pa.	Roybal
Cahill	Hanna	St Germain
Carey	Horton	Scheuer
Celler	Kirwan	Sisk
Clark	Landgrebe	Wilson,
Collier	Mailliard	Charles H.
Corman	Mann	Wolff
Cunningham	May	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 380 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3689. An act to cede to the State of Montana concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over the real property comprising the Veterans' Administration Center, Fort Harrison, Mont.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1647. An act to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 545. An act to amend the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act (80 Stat. 327).

S. 1072. An act to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and titles I, III, IV, and V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended.

S. 1458. An act to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association.

S. 1583. An act to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness.

S. 1685. An act to provide additional assistance for areas suffering a major disaster.

S. 2185. An act to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital

tal region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89-474 (80 Stat. 1324).

S. 2276. An act to extend for 1 year the authorization for research relating to fuels and vehicles under the provisions of the Clean Air Act.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 11400, SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1969

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I assume that the gentleman and other members of the committee propose to take ample time to explain what happened in this conference?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. If the gentleman will yield, what I thought we would do is briefly summarize the conference report itself, and then after the report is adopted, take some time to discuss the overall Government expenditure limitation, which is one of the amendments in technical disagreement and thus not in the report itself.

The other matters in the conference agreement I believe are not very controversial.

Mr. GROSS. I hope not.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman may be assured we will undertake to explain the conference bill.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the gentleman will not neglect the money figures in the bill; that he will give us an adequate explanation as to how these figures differ from the bill as originally approved by the House.

Mr. MAHON. We will do that.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 8, 1969.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

SUMMARY OF THE CONFERENCE BILL

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the items in this conference report are not especially controversial. We had no difficulty in resolving the differences between the two bodies with the exception of amendment No. 90 which relates to an overall limitation on Government spending. It required much discussion in conference before we finally agreed on a compromise. We met on several different days. That matter will come up under a special motion dealing with that amendment.

I should mention that while the bill is a supplemental bill for the fiscal year 1969, which has already expired, it will be recalled that in late June we enacted a special resolution, House Joint Resolution 782, which authorized the various agencies of the Government to proceed to make payments to the employees of the Government and to retired people in anticipation of enactment of the pending bill making the appropriations for increased pay costs. So that to that extent, the pay cost appropriations have in effect already been made for fiscal 1969.

In a number of other instances, lan-

guage in the bill extends the availability of the funds to meet the necessities of the given situations.

Mr. Speaker, the conference bill is \$461 million plus below the budget estimates considered by the House and the Senate. There is a reduction in the budget requests of almost one-half billion dollars.

The conference bill is about \$569 million above the bill as passed by the House. Much of that is due to the fact that additional budget estimates—totaling \$450 million to be exact—were sent to the other body and not originally considered by the House because they were not ready

for presentation to us by the President when we acted on the bill in the House.

The conference bill is below the Senate total by \$107 million.

In the conference bill, there is about \$1.4 billion for pay increases. There is approximately \$1.272 billion included for Southeast Asia—for the war effort. And then there are various items distributed over many agencies and departments of the Government.

Under leave to extend, I include a comparative tabulation summarizing the figures by titles of the bill. The conference report, of course, explains each item of difference in the 92 Senate amendments.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION

Second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969 (H.R. 11400)

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I								
Military operations in Southeast Asia:								
	New budget (obligational) authority	\$1,496,900,000	\$1,234,000,000	\$1,272,000,000	\$1,272,000,000	—\$224,900,000	+\$38,000,000	
	By transfer			(8,910,000)				(—\$8,910,000)
TITLE II								
I	Agriculture:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	13,118,000	9,118,000	13,118,000	13,118,000		+4,000,000	
II	Defense:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	249,682,000	226,050,000	227,950,000	227,000,000	—22,682,000	+950,000	—950,000
	By transfer			(9,377,000)	(4,000,000)	(+4,000,000)	(+4,000,000)	(—5,377,000)
III	District of Columbia:							
	Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority	29,736,000	10,365,000	29,101,000	10,365,000	—19,371,000		—18,736,000
	District of Columbia funds:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	(44,607,000)	(25,353,000)	(44,089,000)	(25,353,000)	(—19,254,000)		(—18,736,000)
IV	Foreign operations:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	162,853,000	2,700,000	160,000,000	160,000,000	—2,853,000	+157,300,000	
	By transfer	(38,000)	(35,000)	(2,735,000)	(2,735,000)	(+2,697,000)	(+2,700,000)	
V	Independent offices—Housing and Urban Development:							
	New budget (obligational) authority:							
	1968	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,158,000			
	1969	494,502,000	306,062,000	498,116,000	486,550,000	—7,952,000	+180,488,000	—1,566,000
	Total	501,670,000	313,230,000	495,284,000	493,718,000	—7,952,000	+180,488,000	—1,566,000
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations	(104,500,000)	(82,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(92,500,000)	(—12,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	(—10,000,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)			
VI	Interior:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	65,136,000	54,227,000	64,225,000	64,225,000	—911,000	+9,998,000	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)			
	By transfer	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)			
	Liquidation cash	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)			
VII	Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	713,707,000	713,707,000	717,826,000	713,966,000	+259,000	+259,000	—3,960,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)			
	(Limitation on salaries and expenses—trust funds)	(16,600,000)		(21,200,000)	(21,200,000)	(+4,700,000)	(+21,200,000)	
	By transfer	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)			
VIII	Legislative branch:							
	New budget (obligational) authority:							
	1968	126,900		126,900	126,900		+126,900	
	1969		30,000	60,000	60,000	+60,000	+30,000	
IX	Public works	70,000,000		70,000,000	70,000,000		+70,000,000	
X	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:							
	New budget (obligational) authority:							
	1968	860,000	10,000	860,000	860,000		+850,000	
	1969	17,606,350	15,013,500	15,799,500	15,799,500	+1,806,850	+786,000	
	Total	18,466,350	15,023,500	16,659,500	16,659,500	—1,806,850	+1,636,000	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)			
	Limitation increase	(147,000)		(147,000)	(147,000)		(+147,000)	
	By transfer	(220,000)	(220,000)	(220,000)	(220,000)			
XI	Transportation:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	7,232,000	2,298,000	4,298,000	2,298,000	—4,934,000		—2,000,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)			
XII	Treasury—Post Office:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	2,755,000	2,285,000	2,695,000	2,695,000	—60,000	+410,000	
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)			

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—Continued

Second supplemental appropriation bill, 1969 (H.R. 11400)—Continued

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
Title II—Continued								
XIII	Claims and judgments.....	\$18,188,688	\$16,880,812	\$18,188,688	\$18,188,688		+\$1,307,876	
Total, title II:								
New budget (obligational) authority:								
	1968.....	8,154,900	7,178,000	8,154,900	8,154,900		+976,900	
	1969.....	1,844,516,038	1,358,736,312	1,811,377,188	1,784,265,188	-\$60,250,850	+425,528,876	-\$27,112,000
	Total.....	1,852,670,938	1,365,914,312	1,819,532,088	1,792,420,088	-60,250,850	+426,505,776	-27,112,000
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....	(104,500,000)	(82,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(92,500,000)	(-12,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(20,489,000)	(20,489,000)	(20,489,000)	(20,489,000)			
	Limitation increases.....	(16,647,000)		(21,347,000)	(21,347,000)	(+4,700,000)	(+21,347,000)	
	By transfer.....	(11,232,000)	(11,229,000)	(23,306,000)	(17,929,000)	(+6,697,000)	(+6,700,000)	(-5,577,000)
	Liquidation cash.....	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)			
Increased pay costs (included above):								
	Budget authority.....	(135,378,400)	(116,456,400)	(124,846,400)	(124,446,400)	(-10,932,000)	(+8,011,000)	(-400,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(18,589,000)	(18,589,000)	(18,589,000)	(18,589,000)			
	By transfer.....	(1,386,000)	(1,383,000)	(3,983,000)	(2,683,000)	(+1,297,000)	(+1,500,000)	(-1,300,000)
	Total.....	(155,553,400)	(136,407,400)	(147,418,400)	(145,718,400)	(-9,635,000)	(+9,311,000)	(1,700,000)
TITLE III								
INCREASED PAY COSTS								
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,464,734,396	1,183,298,454	1,368,137,556	1,287,937,556	-176,796,840	+104,639,102	-80,200,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(59,510,000)	(62,277,000)	(59,741,000)	(59,741,000)	(+231,000)	(-2,536,000)	
	By transfer.....	(85,873,000)	(81,676,000)	(87,916,000)	(84,316,000)	(-1,657,000)	(+2,640,000)	(-3,600,000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....	(24,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(-2,000,000)		
TITLE V								
GENERAL PROVISIONS								
	Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill (H. Doc. 91-50).....	(630,000)	(630,000)	(630,000)	(630,000)			
RECAPITULATION								
Grand total, titles I, II, III, and V:								
New budget (obligational) authority:								
	1968.....	8,154,900	7,178,000	8,154,900	8,154,900		+976,900	
	1969.....	4,806,150,434	3,776,034,766	4,451,514,744	4,344,202,744	-461,947,690	+568,167,978	-107,312,000
	Total.....	4,814,305,334	3,783,212,766	4,459,669,644	4,352,357,644	-461,947,690	+569,144,878	-107,312,000
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....	(104,500,000)	(82,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(92,500,000)	(-12,000,000)	(+10,000,000)	(-10,000,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(79,999,000)	(82,766,000)	(80,230,000)	(80,230,000)	(+231,000)	(-2,536,000)	
	By transfer.....	(97,105,000)	(92,905,000)	(120,132,000)	(102,245,000)	(+15,140,000)	(+9,340,000)	(-17,887,000)
	Liquidation cash.....	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)			
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....	(40,870,000)	(22,223,000)	(43,570,000)	(43,570,000)	(+2,700,000)	(+22,347,000)	
	Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds or personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill.....	(630,000)	(630,000)	(630,000)	(630,000)			
Increased pay costs (included above):								
	Budget authority.....	(1,600,112,796)	(1,299,733,854)	(1,492,983,956)	(1,412,383,956)	(-187,728,840)	(+112,650,102)	(-80,600,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(78,099,000)	(80,866,000)	(78,330,000)	(78,330,000)	(+231,000)	(-2,536,000)	
	By transfer.....	(87,259,000)	(83,059,000)	(91,899,000)	(86,999,000)	(-260,000)	(+3,940,000)	(-4,900,000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....	(24,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(22,223,000)	(-2,000,000)		
	Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill.....	(630,000)	(630,000)	(630,000)	(630,000)			
	Total.....	(1,790,323,796)	(1,486,511,854)	(1,686,065,956)	(1,600,565,956)	(-189,757,840)	(+114,054,102)	(-85,600,000)

OVERALL EXPENDITURE LIMITATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE).

(Mr. TEAGUE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am very frank to admit that I do not know exactly what this bill does or what the report does insofar as our veterans' programs are concerned. For that reason, I would like to ask the chairman a couple of questions.

I would like to point out that when the second supplemental was considered on the floor I queried the chairman as to the status of veterans' programs under the proposed ceiling which the House adopted. At that time the gentleman

from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) told me that any action taken by the Congress to increase veterans' benefits or to increase appropriations for the operation of the agency would automatically increase the ceiling and that there was no need for a special exemption for veterans' benefits and programs and services. When this legislation reached the Senate it was handled differently and Senator TALMADGE offered an amendment which specifically exempted all veterans' benefits and services from the expenditure ceiling. My question is, What disposition did the conferees make of the Senate amendment, and specifically, is there anything included in the conference report which exempts veterans' benefits and services from the ceiling?

I would like to remind the gentleman

that last week when the independent offices appropriation bill of fiscal 1970 was considered in the House, the Appropriations Committee recommended and the House adopted a budget for the Veterans' Administration of about \$50 million in excess of the recommendation of the revised budget. This was mostly for hospital construction and additional personnel for the medical program and some general operating expenses. The committee added these additional funds because it recognized that the Veterans' Administration is experiencing a rising workload as a result of the Vietnam conflict. Here we have the Appropriations Committee recognizing on one hand that VA is in a special category because of the Vietnam conflict, and at the same time a general ceiling is being imposed, as I understand it, \$1 billion less than the re-

vised budget. What assurances do we have that the Veterans' Administration will not be required to take a portion of that \$1 billion cut while at the same time the Congress is attempting to give the agency more money to meet its rising caseload?

Mr. MAHON. With regard to the colloquy which we had when the bill was originally before us, the answer is still the same as it was at that time, the same answer given by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and by myself.

The other body exempted veterans benefits and services. The other body exempted more than half of the spending budget, in fact.

However, in the conference version of the bill now before us, reference is made to the Veteran's Administration, in a limited way in connection with the so-called cushion which I shall explain later, but the Veterans' Administration is not otherwise specifically exempted. Under the conference agreement, a cut should be applied to any agency, including the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a comment?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. It is true, as I am sure the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) will agree, that about \$5 billion of the Veterans' Administration budget is for compensation and pensions that are fixed by law.

I could not conceive of any President of the United States wanting to make cuts in compensation and pensions in the first place. But furthermore, because of the mandatory nature of them, I do not believe he would be able to make any cuts in those items, and they take care of most of the items in the VA.

Mr. MAHON. It is further true that if Congress appropriates funds above and beyond the budget requests for the Veterans' Administration that would tend to adjust the ceiling upward to make allowance for the related expenditures.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Of course, everyone knows that the workload of the VA is increasing every day, and the gentleman says it tends to adjust, but I would ask the gentleman if we pass legislation which increases the cost of the VA, does it not automatically increase the ceiling?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, the gentleman is right. It would automatically increase the ceiling. The language in that respect in the conference agreement is on all fours with what was in the original House bill.

And in the independent offices and Department of Housing appropriation bill for 1970, the gentleman will recall that for medical care in the Veterans' Administration there was an increase of \$17.6 million above the budget; for construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities, an increase above the budget of \$13.9 million; and \$3 million was provided above the budget for grants for construction of State nursing homes—a total of \$34 million above the budget.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. In that independent office appropriation bill that

is about \$50 million above the budget, this was mostly for kidney machines and for intensive care wards, for renovation and for construction. Now, as I understand this bill today it is \$1 billion less than the revised budget. Is there any assurance that the VA will not be required to take a portion of the \$1 billion cut while at the same time the Congress attempts to give it some more money because of its rising workload?

Mr. MAHON. It is inconceivable to me that this Congress, which is very friendly toward veterans and veterans causes, would take any action which would be adverse to the welfare of the returning servicemen and veterans. So I do not believe there is any reason whatever for concern in this regard.

Now, with regard to the \$1 billion cut, I would hopefully assume that the Congress this year will cut more than \$1 billion in expenditures, in which event this feature of the pending conference agreement will be relatively meaningless, especially so with respect to the Veterans' Administration.

So I do not believe there is any reason for apprehension, and I can assure the gentleman from Texas, the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, that we will work with the gentleman in a determined and, in my opinion, successful effort to take care of the needs of the veterans, and to see to it that any necessary requirements are taken care of.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

My purpose in taking the floor at this time is to express my concern and the concern of the suburban communities about deletion of \$18.7 million from the conference report of the District of Columbia's portion of the funds necessary to start construction of a mass transit system for the Washington metropolitan area.

This delay in starting the system is naturally of concern to everyone. The Congress has acknowledged, then confirmed and reconfirmed time and time again, the need for a rapid transit system in the Washington area if we are ever going to solve our transportation problems. The surrounding communities have also recognized this need and have likewise recognized that they must pay a large portion of the cost of its construction. All of the surrounding communities combined have agreed to pay \$573 million of the total cost. Most of the communities approved bond referendums last fall to pay their proportionate share. Further delay in construction of this system will cost more money, and since the need for the system is so great, all of us are most anxious to get started with its construction.

But, Mr. Speaker, mass transit is only a part of our problem. Everyone who knows anything about transportation, as the Congress has repeatedly agreed,

knows that a balanced transportation system is essential. This means we must have the necessary number of highways, freeways, bridges and other automobile facilities as well as a mass transit system if the problem is to be solved. The delay in construction of these other transportation facilities has been absolutely ridiculous, and has cost us tens of millions of dollars in additional costs as well as many times that amount in public inconvenience.

An example of how ridiculous this delay has been is the case of the Dulles Airport. We spent \$100 million for a new additional airport to serve the area, including an access road which dead ends at the Capital Beltway, Interstate Route 495. It was intended at the time that Interstate Route 66 and adequate Potomac River crossings would provide easy and ready access to this new airport. The airport has now been open for approximately 7 years and is still only being used to a fraction of its capacity while Washington National Airport increases in its use each year even after it has passed the point of being dangerously overcrowded.

One of the main reasons why Dulles is not used more than it is, is the fact that the connecting highway links which were planned over 10 years ago have not been started. This is because of pure stubbornness on the part of the District of Columbia government in steadfastly refusing to approve its portion of the construction projects so that connecting links can be made.

This particular example of the confusion this delay has caused was, along with many others, called to the attention of the House Committee on Public Works when that committee was considering the 1968 Highway Act. The members of that committee were most reluctant to get involved in the specific location and administrative details of the construction of highway projects. But, since they recognized that the delay had been so long that further delay could not be tolerated, particularly in view of the fact that this is the Nation's Capital, and they were considering Federal highway projects, they found it necessary to instruct the District government to proceed forthwith with these projects in the 1968 Highway Act. Amazingly, the District of Columbia City Council has placed itself above the Congress of the United States and the American people, and has completely ignored this mandate of Congress. The Congress, therefore, has no choice but to insist that its will be carried out.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately it now appears that if the Congress does appropriate these transit funds at this time, we would appear to be acquiescing, and that we would accept the fact that the District is ignoring our mandate and can do so. To do so would encourage the District government to continue to defy the will of Congress and to continue to delay construction of these vitally needed highway projects.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to permit further delay in these vitally needed projects. I feel that we should again insist that the District government must pro-

ceed immediately with construction of the projects so that we can release these transit funds and permit construction on the transit system as well. I have consulted with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), on many occasions about this problem, urging that the necessary funds be appropriated to begin construction of the transit system immediately. He has given me assurance on many occasions that he does intend to release these funds—and I am hopeful that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), so that he can advise us as to his position and the position of the Appropriations Committee regarding these funds.

Mr. MAHON. I will say to the gentleman that the other body added to the bill the following language:

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", \$18,736,000, of which \$1,514,000 shall not be available for expenditure until July 1, 1969.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), a member of the conference committee, for comment in regard to what the conferees did about this question and why the conferees did what they did.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like first to say to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) and my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) and all of those other Representatives from the adjoining metropolitan area that all down through the years we have appreciated their attitude and the stand they have taken in regard to the freeway-rapid transit impasse that we are now confronted with.

I know the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Maryland believe that there is a place in our Capital City for both a freeway system and a rapid transit system.

Mr. Speaker, that is the position of our committee. We believe that there is a place for both a freeway system and a rapid rail transit system in our Capital City. In order to meet the tremendous day-by-day growth of traffic, the highway program must be carried out along with the presently authorized rapid rail transit system.

In 1958, after a 5-year study, the freeway program was set up for the District of Columbia. Since that time millions of dollars have been appropriated for this system and today we have in Federal and District funds over \$200,000,000 on hand that cannot be used.

Just to give you some idea, Mr. Speaker, of the cost of some of these projects and how the cost has increased—back in 1961 when we had the east leg of the freeway system before our committee, it was explained that the cost would amount to \$26,100,000. Today, in 1969, the cost is estimated at \$78,000,000. That gives you an example of what this impasse has done in regard to the freeway system here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about this matter, our committee still is of the opinion that there is a place for both systems here in the District of Columbia.

Beginning back in 1962 we started having trouble over the freeway system.

In 1966—as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) knows, as well as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE) and my good friend, the ranking minority member of the District of Columbia Budget Subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS) also know—we appeared before the House and recommended that the rapid transit money be deleted because the freeway system had been stopped. We said to the Members of the House at that time, Mr. Speaker, that when the freeway system started and when they in good faith started repairing the streets in the District of Columbia, we would come before the House and recommend the rapid transit money.

After the bill passed the House and while it was before the other body, the National Capital Planning Commission was called back into session and on a vote of 6 to 5, they started the freeway system.

We came back with the conference report on that bill and, as my friend from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) knows, I said to the House, "The freeway system is now underway," and we receded and recommended the rapid transit money. My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS), will tell you that within a few weeks after that time the National Capital Planning Commission was called back into session and changed their vote, and at that time they stopped the freeway system.

In order that there may not be any misunderstanding, we want the House to know that as soon as the freeway program gets under way beyond recall, then we will come back to the House and recommend that construction funds for rapid transit be approved.

The Federal Highway Act of 1968 passed the House and the Senate, and was signed by the President of the United States in August of 1968. As my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL), knows, the Highway Act of 1968 is the law that we must operate under at this time.

I want to read just a portion of that law which pertains to the freeways of the District of Columbia. The portion of the bill providing for the District of Columbia reads as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SEC. 23. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, or any court decision or administrative action to the contrary, the Secretary of Transportation and the government of the District of Columbia shall, in addition to those routes already under construction, construct all routes on the Interstate System within the District of Columbia as set forth in the document entitled "1968 Estimate of the Cost of Completion of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways in the District of Columbia" submitted to Congress by the Secretary of Transportation with, and as a part of "The 1968 Interstate System Cost Estimate" printed as House Document Numbered 199, Ninetieth Congress. Such construction shall be undertaken as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this Act, except as otherwise provided in this section, and shall be carried out in accordance with all applicable provisions of title 23 of the United States Code.

(b) Not later than 30 days after the date

of enactment of this section the government of the District of Columbia shall commence work on the following projects:

(1) Three Sisters Bridge, I-266 (Section B1 to B2).

(2) Potomac River Freeway I-266 (Section B2 to B4).

(3) Center Leg of the Inner Loop, I-95 (Section A6 to C4), terminating at New York Avenue.

(4) East Leg of the Inner Loop, I-295 (Section C1 to C4), terminating at Bladensburg Road.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) knows this act was passed by the House and the Senate and it is the law today—Public Law 90-495.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Public Works Committee brought this bill before the House, explained it in detail, and the bill was then passed by both Houses and signed into law, we find that the District Building ignores it. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that every day since that law was signed on August 23, 1968, the District Building has completely ignored it.

Our new President, in his message of April 28, 1969, to the Congress, on the District of Columbia, made this statement. Before reading it, I want you to know that this is the first time in 10 long years that any President has had the nerve and the courage to state the facts. Let me read to you what our new President said. This is a portion of his message:

Mass transit must be part of a balanced transportation network. A subway will not relieve local governments of the duty to modernize and improve their highway systems and other forms of transportation, so that all citizens have an adequate choice as to how they travel. Clearly, the impasse that has arisen between proponents of road and rail transportation in the Washington Metropolitan area has contributed little to the progress of either. There are, however, hopeful signs that a fair and effective settlement of these issues will be reached in the near future. It is in the interest of all those involved—central city dwellers, suburbanites, shoppers, employees, and visitors alike—that this be done.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with every word of this statement that I have just read.

Mr. Speaker, in the supplemental estimates submitted to the House, we had a request for \$18,737,000 to start construction of a rapid transit system. We decided not to take action at that time. The supplemental went to the other body and they added this amount to the bill. In conference the other side receded, and it is not in the bill. In connection with the regular bill for fiscal year 1970, we have the sum of \$21,586,000 requested as the District's share for construction of the authorized rapid rail transit system.

I will say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) that in addition to that, we also have the sum of \$1,299,200 requested for the District's share for operating expenses.

I want the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Maryland to note that as soon as the freeway system is started and underway according to the Highway Act of 1968, we will come to the House and recommend funds for the authorized rapid rail transit system.

In closing, a bill is before the House Committee on the District of Columbia,

chaired by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. McMILLAN) which provides for Federal grants of \$1,047,000,000 for a regional rapid transit system. The bill that authorized the basic rapid rail transit system in 1965 provided for a 25-mile system to cost \$431 million. The bill now pending before the District of Columbia legislative committee calls for \$1,047,000,000 in Federal grants. The rapid rail transit system proposed under that bill is 97 miles, not 25 miles—that the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS) asked about a number of years ago. They said at that time it would cost \$431 million. Now they say it will cost \$2.5 billion and the Federal Government will have to put up \$1,047,000,000 in Federal grants in addition to the amount authorized in 1965 of \$100 million.

As the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL) knows, the impasse with which we are confronted is certainly not helping that bill any. I want the gentleman from Virginia, and the gentleman from Maryland, and my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS)—who has been fair, and sound about this matter all through the years—to know how our committee feels about it.

This is the position of our committee.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the member of the conference, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that the gentleman from Kentucky has stated this matter completely and fairly, as I know it from my work on the subcommittee with the gentleman.

Both this Congress and the President have expressed themselves in support of a balanced transportation system. As soon as there is some assurance that we are to have a balanced transportation system, the gentleman from Kentucky and I are committed to providing the initial funds that were included in this supplemental request, and the followup funds that are provided in the 1970 budget.

I think that is a fair position to take, and I think it is the only position we could reasonably take in the light of the mandate of this House in the 1968 Highway Act.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield now such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky.

I am going to take the position of supporting the gentleman both in the District Committee and publicly. I think the impasse has reached desperate proportions. We are about to put 70,000 people between the Agriculture Building and the Capitol on Independence Avenue, and there is no way in the world we can get those people in and out without a subway system.

I may have reservations about the highway system, but I think it has been clearly stated that the impasse cannot go on any longer.

I publicly urge both the District Building and all others involved, to meet the conditions so we can create a subway system. As I understand the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), if they indicate the conditions which have been set forth are being met and being started, the subway system will start, and then we will have both things operating in Washington, D.C., and we need them.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

The gentleman from Kentucky is completely correct that the District government has refused to obey the law. We have a deep concern over the fact that every day we fail to start construction of this transit system it is costing approximately \$250,000.

Last week I stated here on the floor my support of reinstatement of the \$18.7 million for construction of the District of Columbia portion of the regional rapid rail transit system. I do not believe it is in the best interest to hold one part of our transportation system hostage to the other.

I should merely like to express our deep concern and regret over this situation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BROYHILL).

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) for his further assurance regarding his support of the funds to start construction of our transit system. I also want to commend the gentleman from Kentucky for his untiring efforts in helping us to solve the transportation crisis in the Nation's Capital. The gentleman is absolutely correct in pointing out that we must have a balanced transportation system and that delay on any portion of it is not acceptable and will not be tolerated.

There has already been delay in excess of 10 years on a major portion of the highway and freeway system. It is now quite apparent that the appropriation of these funds at this time would encourage further delay to the extent that we may be several more years in commencing the construction on the other needed parts of the transportation system. I therefore join with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) in expressing my support of the position taken by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER) and by the Appropriations Committee, in holding up these funds until the District of Columbia government complies with the mandate of the Congress. If they continue to ignore the Congress then I suggest the withholding of other appropriations until they recognize that this is the Nation's Capital and the will of the Congress and the American people must prevail.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3

minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS).

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I expect every Member in the Chamber would agree with me that when we have a bill involving 92 separate amendments one could not find a conference committee which would agree on every dollar figure agreed on in the conference.

Conferences are just exactly what the word indicates they are, conferences between two differing groups trying to reconcile differences between two bills.

I believe, as a member of the conference committee, that we did very well in it. We gave in on some items to the Senate. The Senate conceded on some items. And we compromised some.

As the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the conference, has already indicated, the conference report is \$461,947,690 below the budget. It is a half billion dollars above the House-passed bill. But, as the gentleman from Texas explained, \$450 million of that increase was not even considered in the House, because the items were first submitted in the Senate.

If we eliminate the items the House did not have an opportunity to consider, which were added in the Senate, the bill would be only about \$100 million above the House figure. It is \$107,312,000 below the Senate figure.

The conference report represents the best judgment of the conferees. It was signed by all the managers on the part of the House.

I join the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee, in urging adoption of the conference report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I merely wish to point out I believe the position our good friend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER), has taken—and his offer of support under the conditions he outlined—is completely fair and should have the unanimous support of the House of Representatives.

I speak because of the fact that I did have a hand in the Subway System Act of the District of Columbia and do feel a responsibility with reference thereto. However, I also want to say that the gentleman's recommendation is very fair and in my opinion it is one that we can follow.

OVERALL EXPENDITURE LIMITATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Now, can we have some discussion of the proposed expenditure ceiling and some discussion of the reasons why the personnel ceilings were cast aside? What were the circumstances surrounding those actions?

Mr. MAHON. Those are amendments which will be presented after the report

itself is acted upon. I thought it might be more appropriate to discuss those matters as they occur as they are not a part of the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. They are not a part of the conference report?

Mr. MAHON. No. They are reported back in technical disagreement.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but we will be voting on the conference report very shortly, will we not?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, and we will be voting later on the amendments in disagreement at which time I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I shall thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me say that I find no economy in this bill, none at all, for it contains approximately a half billion dollars more than it did when approved by the House. I understand that a substantial amount of the increase is due to salary increases, but regardless of the nature of the expenditure it is nevertheless increased spending at a time the country faces a financial crisis and taxes are being increased.

And the action of the House-Senate conference on this legislation, wiping out all vestige of the personnel ceiling that was imposed last year, as well as juggling with the expenditure ceiling, plus the increase of \$160 million in the funding of soft loan window of the International Development Association, makes this conference report unacceptable and I shall vote against it.

FAIR HOUSING, NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS, AND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. HAWKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAWKINS. In amendment No. 24 as I read it, you have deleted \$1 million for the enforcement of the fair housing program and in amendment No. 40 you have eliminated or reduced to the extent of \$2.5 million the amount for the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. No. 42 appears to reduce educational opportunity grants by \$16 million.

Am I correct in this being the effect of the conference report and, if so, could you enlighten us as to the justification for those reductions?

Mr. MAHON. With respect to the additional funds for fair housing enforcement, funds had already been provided for that purpose in the regular bill for 1969 and they are also provided in the regular bill for fiscal 1970. In fact, the House increased the 1970 figure above what the committee recommended. When we conferred on this item we were approaching the end of the fiscal year and we thought these funds should be deleted and that ample funds had been made available already in the regular 1970 bill.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman refers to "we," is the gentleman talking about the House conferees or the Senate conferees?

Mr. MAHON. The Senate receded to the House position.

Mr. HAWKINS. Was it the Senate position to appropriate the \$1 million or was it the position of the House conferees not to appropriate it?

Mr. MAHON. Not to appropriate it.

Mr. HAWKINS. With respect to the Neighborhood Youth Corps program, amendment No. 40, there appears to be a reduction of \$2.5 million. In light of the fact that this program is being reduced—the NYC program—by at least 25 percent, we are receiving a tremendous number of questions with reference to it. How does the chairman justify this reduction?

Mr. MAHON. In amendment No. 40 the Senate provided for an amount to carry out section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 as amended—\$10 million, to remain available until September 30, 1969.

There was no budget request for the \$10 million. The Congress had already provided a very large sum for this purpose for fiscal year 1969. Of course, fiscal year 1969 has expired.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations went above the budget and inserted \$7.5 million.

There was an addition of \$2.5 million on the Senate floor, as the gentleman knows. The House took the position that the \$7.5 million in the committee version of the Senate bill was as far as we should go at this time, and the Senate receded from its floor amendment.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that this program is being reduced throughout the country, and that there are a tremendous number of applicants for this program who are being told that other programs are available, but these applicants are unable to find these other programs. So that we are cutting back on these youth programs when there is unrest building up in the cities, especially in view of the fact that just a few days ago, or a week ago, almost, we did pass a new tax bill, putting a new tax on the American people on the theory that the money would be used for these programs, and yet the position apparently of the conferees of this House was that this money could be cut back at this time for economy reasons, apparently.

Mr. MAHON. The real decisions with respect to these programs will be made in the regular bills. They were made last year generally through that procedure, and they will be made this year generally through that procedure. This is an additional sum of \$7.5 million above the budget for a fiscal year which has already ended, but the conference agreement would make the funds available until September 30, 1969.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I do not believe the record should stand without it being made perfectly clear that this is not the only money available for this purpose. There was in a supplemental bill a substantial amount of money for this very purpose when it passed for 1969. This item was not considered by the House committee, because it was unbudgeted. It was put in the bill on the Senate side. We thought we were being generous, if I may use that word, in adding \$7.5 million to the substantial sums of money that were made available in the regular bill.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me that you cannot square that against the fact that this program is being reduced. The gentleman says that money is available but in this amendment and in the next amendment, the educational opportunity grants—and I am sure other Members of the House are receiving letters from the higher institutions of learning in which they say that they do not have money to take care of the people who come to their doors—

Mr. JONAS. I am sure that the gentleman understands that this is not a regular bill; this is a supplemental bill for a fiscal year that has already expired. We are marking up the regular HEW bill for 1970 today, which will contain funds for the program for fiscal year 1970 just as the regular bill for 1969 made funds available for fiscal 1969.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from California that Congress has already provided about \$139 million for this purpose, and in this bill we provide an additional \$7.5 million above the budget for these programs, which seemed to be the best that could be agreed upon at this time. And now, as we are beginning the new fiscal year 1970, there will be additional appropriation requests in which the House will have the opportunity, as well as in the other body, to work our will with respect to these manpower programs.

Mr. HAWKINS. What the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is saying is that in this current fiscal year they are going to provide fully the funding for these educational and manpower programs in accordance with the authorizations, and I am very glad to get that commitment. I hope the gentleman will live up to that commitment. I think it is very obvious that across this country these programs are not being funded fully, as they have been authorized, and that we are building up an explosive situation in the inner cities, because this House has failed to appropriate the money even after the authorization, which is itself inadequate, and has been authorized by this House.

I think it is time for us to stop talking about this so-called economy when we are not meeting the budgeted needs of the people of this country. I get the budgetary explanation, but it certainly does not satisfy me.

I hope that this commitment which apparently seems to be made that you are going to fund fully these programs in the current fiscal year that you did not do in the last fiscal year. I hope that commitment is met.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to repudiate emphatically that the gentleman from Texas now speaking has committed himself with reference to any future legislation involving these programs.

I simply meant to say, and I believe I did say, that for the fiscal year 1970 we will have further opportunity to weigh and consider sums which may be provided for the purpose and that the House of Representatives and the other body would have adequate opportunity to work its will approving the budget requests, or raising the figures or lowering them as might be determined.

But to intimate that anyone in the House has committed himself to appropriation of the full authorizations is completely beside the point and is not correct.

Mr. HAWKINS. I misunderstood the gentleman then.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Is there by any chance any money in this bill for certain Members of the House of Representatives—the gentleman will recall an authorizing bill providing a pay increase for certain Members of the House was passed by the House and sent to the other body and then recommitted to the committee? Is there any money in this bill to provide for those pay increases if and when that authorization bill is passed?

Mr. MAHON. The other body made no changes in items in the House bill that relate solely to housekeeping items of the House, with respect to additional pay or otherwise. That is the time-honored procedure. And I should add that the amounts in the House bill for the additional pay to which the gentleman refers—which were discussed when we had the bill on the floor in May—will shortly lapse if the authorization bill is not soon enacted.

The question in respect to fiscal 1970 will arise when the regular bill for 1970 comes along.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks previously made.)

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a question in the light of what has been discussed here during the past few minutes.

I notice in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations on page 17 in amendments 41, 42, and 43 there has been a cutting and a minimization of the amount of moneys in this supplemental budget.

Then, if you turn to page 4 under title I, for the Department of Defense, we have increased that amount which the other body has asked for in this supplemental budget.

I would like to get some kind of explanation, in the light of what is happening, as to why the House in its conference report recommended this increase in the amendments to which I have referred, amendments numbered 41, 42, and 43.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), a member of the conference committee, for his comments with regard to amendments numbered 41 and 42 involving the \$16 million for educational opportunity grants.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from New York that in the first place the amount appropriated for educational opportunity grants in the regular Labor-HEW appropriations for 1969 was a reduction of \$16 million from

the budget request. This is the history of this item. It was originally put in last year's bill by the other body. It was not considered by the House, because it was not authorized at the time the House acted on the appropriations bill. The conferees agreed upon an appropriation of \$124,600,000 for educational opportunity grants, which was \$16 million below the budget estimate and the Senate allowance.

There was no supplemental request by either the Johnson or the Nixon administrations for additional funds for this program, and none were included in the supplemental bill as it passed the House. Since it was not budgeted, and was not included in the House bill, and would have restored a deliberate reduction made by the Congress in the regular bill, it was dropped in the conference report.

This is no reflection on the program. Personally, as a matter of fact, I am just as much for it as you are. That is not true of all of the committee—but that is the history. I find no fault with it.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I was disappointed when the conferees eliminated from the bill we are now considering an amendment which would have restored the \$16 million which was cut last year from the educational opportunity grants program.

Adoption of this amendment would have meant that this program would have been fully funded. Not only this program but all the others the Federal Government has a part in which provide assistance to deserving youngsters so that they can obtain a higher education must be fully funded or the cost in terms of missed opportunities will be vast.

In its education budget requests to fund these various student assistance programs for the 1970 fiscal year, the administration has adopted the position that all these programs, the educational opportunity grants program, the college work-study program, the national defense education loan program, and the medical professions loan program need not be fully funded because the slack will be picked up by the guaranteed student loan program. Such a position is untenable and demonstrates once more the administration's tendency to overlook the facts in presenting their budget requests.

If the administration's budget requests for the educational opportunity grants program are adopted, the result will be that 45,000 fewer students will receive the assistance the program provides. If their requests for the national defense student loan program are adopted, less than half the approved requests from students and their families for assistance under the program will be able to be honored. If the administration's budget requests for the college work-study program are approved, the result will be that 20,000 fewer students will participate. In the medical professions loan program, the administration's budget requests would provide half the funds which were available last year. These are the facts.

In view of this situation, can the guaranteed student loan program pick up

the slack? The facts say it cannot. This program was designed to provide assistance to middle-income families with incomes of under \$15,000 so their sons and daughters can get the benefit of a higher education. The facts say that 85 percent of the loans made under this program were made to families with incomes of under \$12,000. The facts also say that 57 percent of these loans were made to families with incomes of under \$6,000. Thus, the program has not reached the income level it was intended to. I have no objection whatever to loans being made to these families. What I do object to is the administration's view that programs which are designed specifically to assist youngsters from low-income homes be cut and the slack taken up by a middle-income program. Middle-income taxpayers support these programs with their taxes. They have every right to participate. However under the administration plan they will not be able to since all loans under the program will go to very low-income families. I believe all these student loan programs should be fully funded. The result of such action on our part will provide that both low- and middle-income youngsters can obtain the help of the Federal Government in continuing their educations. If we had adopted the amendment of the Senate committee restoring cuts in the educational opportunity grants programs we would have made our position on this matter clear. However, I am hopeful that, when the Labor Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill is considered, we will act and make our thoughts on the matter quite clear.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1969, like the bill already passed by the House on May 20—H.R. 11400—lumps together funds which are necessary for important domestic programs with some \$1.2 billion for military operations in Southeast Asia.

This means a choice of either approving the entire package recommended by the conferees, and thereby allocating still more funds to the prosecution of the war in Vietnam, or voting against the entire supplemental appropriations bill. I regret that the House Appropriations Committee has put us in this situation again. As the Members are well aware, there is strong and conscientious opposition to the continuation of the war in Vietnam. There should be an opportunity for Members to vote separately on the \$1.2 billion contained in this package for additional funds for military operations in Southeast Asia. As long as these funds for the Vietnam war remain in the conference report, I cannot support it. As I pointed out during the debate on H.R. 11400 on May 20, one-third of the total amount of money allocated in this package is for prosecuting the war in Vietnam. This is in addition to the some \$27 or \$28 billion which Congress has already appropriated for the war for fiscal year 1969.

As a matter of fact, the conference report increases by \$38 million the amount of money which was provided in the bill as it passed the House on May 20.

The increases approved in conference include an additional \$7 million for naval military personnel and \$31 million in additional funds for Air Force military personnel. That funds for Southeast Asian military operations could have been actually increased in the face of our mounting domestic crisis is an indication of the overall failure of Congress to reallocate funds in the Federal budget on the basis of the multitude of problems confronting the cities and the unmet social needs of our society.

As in past years, the costs of the war have been underestimated. Each year for the past 5 years Congress has been asked to appropriate supplementary funds for the Vietnam war. On each of those occasions—in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, and now 1969—I have pointed out that the only means Congress has to affect Vietnam policy is through the power of the purse. Today Congress has another opportunity to assert control over the conduct of the war. The funds allocated by Congress for the war do more than support our troops. They support the war policy of the administration. What has the policy of the Johnson and now the Nixon administration been since the last occasion on which Congress voted funds in support of the war?

Since May 1968, when the Paris peace talks began, over 14,000 American servicemen have been killed. The destruction and suffering which have been the lot of the Vietnamese people for over 20 years continue unabated.

On June 8 at his conference with South Vietnamese President Thieu on Midway Island, President Nixon announced that he would withdraw 25,000 American troops over the next 3 months. Does this mean that the end of the war is finally in sight? Regrettably, I do not think that it does. In the first place, both President Nixon and President Thieu went to great lengths to point out that this was not really a withdrawal of troops but the replacement of our troops with the South Vietnamese forces. Second, as our former chief negotiator in Paris under President Johnson, Governor Averell Harriman, has pointed out, 25,000 troops is not a significant number and will not affect the negotiations in Paris, which have now been stalled for over a year. During the course of a recent radio interview with me, Governor Harriman emphasized a reduction in the violence by both sides as an essential prerequisite to a negotiated settlement in Paris, and urged that, since the United States had issued orders to General Abrams for all-out fighting, the United States should take the lead in reducing the level of fighting.

Contrary to the optimistic statements of the Nixon administration, the end is still not in sight. The only way that the Congress can exercise any influence on the direction of our foreign policy in Southeast Asia is to vote "No" on appropriations for the war.

For 5 years now the critics of the war in Vietnam have been urging alternative policies in Southeast Asia. In 1964, I urged a specific strategy for neutralization of Southeast Asia to avoid broadening the conflict. But the conflict was

broadened. In 1965, I argued against the Americanization of the war and against escalating our military commitment. But the war was Americanized and our commitment escalated. In 1966, I again pointed to the policy alternatives available to us. But instead the choice of continued escalation was made. In 1967, I called for renewed diplomatic efforts and an end to the bombing in the north. But diplomacy took a back seat to the continued emphasis on imposing a military solution.

In March of 1968, candidate Richard M. Nixon said "the next President of the United States must end the war in Vietnam," and indicated he had specific diplomatic strategies in mind as a way of hastening a settlement of the conflict.

Today, despite the fact that the Paris negotiations continue to produce no progress, that the killing of hundreds of American servicemen each week goes on, that South Vietnam continues to be destroyed so that it may be "saved"—President Nixon hails the withdrawal of 25,000 American troops as "the opening of the door" to peace.

In South Vietnam, President Thieu has shut down the 37th newspaper since the Saigon government announced an end to press censorship over a year ago, warned the South Vietnamese population that advocates of a coalition government will be punished, and summoned South Vietnamese citizens to police headquarters for "questioning" because they called for a "government of reconciliation" and a negotiated settlement to the war.

This is the state of the war in Vietnam today, for which the conference report before us appropriates an additional \$1.2 billion.

As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, the request for supplemental funds for Southeast Asian military operations has been tied to other appropriations for some vital domestic programs which I support and, in several cases, have even proposed.

On January 30, I introduced an omnibus supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 5562, to fully fund several important housing programs established under the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968. This legislation would provide supplemental appropriations to bring the section 235 homeownership program, the section 236 rental and cooperative housing program, the rent supplement program, the urban renewal program, and the urban renewal component of the model cities program to the full amounts authorized by Congress.

The conference report includes supplemental appropriations for three programs—section 235, section 236, and low-rent public housing. Both sections 235 and 236 would receive an additional \$45 million for fiscal year 1969—which, although it is \$5 million more than was approved by the House, still leaves each program \$5 million below the amount authorized by Congress. The low-rent public housing program—which remains the only effective way to reach low-income people in our large urban areas—would receive an additional \$7,168,000 for

fiscal year 1968 and \$16 million for fiscal year 1969 in contract authorization.

While I am pleased that the conference report has recommended supplemental appropriations for these three programs, I am disappointed that it does not provide additional funds for the rent supplement program. Each year the rent supplement program has been starved for funds; the current fiscal year is no exception. While the administration recommended \$65 million for rent supplements for fiscal year 1969, Congress appropriated only \$30 million. Urban renewal, which also would receive no additional funds, was appropriated only \$312 million although it was authorized to receive \$500 million.

These programs must be funded to the full amount authorized by Congress if there is to be an effective attack of the housing crisis which besets our cities. As has been the case so often before, the supplementary amount recommended for the war in this conference report alone is greater than the amount which would be needed to fully fund urgently needed housing programs.

I am also disturbed that the \$1 million appropriation to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for enforcement of fair housing—under title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968—which was approved by the Senate, has been deleted in the conference report. In its budget request HUD requested \$2 million to carry on fair housing activities.

As Housing and Urban Development Secretary Romney stated in his testimony in support of this appropriation request for enforcing fair housing:

It is simply impossible to attain this goal (providing a decent home in a suitable living environment for every American family) without a major and continuing effort in pursuit of fair housing for every person in this country. (Parentheses added.) (Hearings on Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1969, p. 570.)

At present, the fair housing program has received only \$2 million to carry on its efforts from Congress. If the fair housing provisions of the 1968 Civil Rights Act are to have meaning, Congress must allocate sufficient resources to fulfill that goal.

During debate on past omnibus appropriation bills, the argument has been made that, since appropriations for important domestic programs are included, the bills should be supported despite the fact that they include appropriations for the war.

I cannot accept that argument because it ignores two basic factors.

First, it is simply not true that the defeat of this bill because of the inclusion of appropriations for the Vietnam war would result in the cutting off of funds for domestic programs. If the House refused to approve the conference report because it contained appropriations earmarked for Southeast Asian military operations, the war funds would be removed, and the other parts of the bill would come back to the floor.

Second, and perhaps more fundamentally, it must be recognized that the vital domestic programs, which are presently receiving leftover scale support, will

never be fully funded until the costly Vietnam war is terminated. As long as appropriation bills continue to allocate one-third of available resources to Southeast Asian military operations—as does this bill—our cities will continue to rot; our economy will continue to deteriorate; and our unmet social needs will remain unmet. The solution of our domestic crisis must be preceded by the termination of the Vietnam war.

For 5 long years Congress, through the appropriations process, has acquiesced in a disastrous policy. Some 36,600 American servicemen have been killed and many thousands more maimed and wounded.

For 5 long years the war has consumed national resources desperately needed to combat urban problems. Each year the end of the war, at least according to the administration, was just around the corner—especially at appropriations time. And each year the administration has returned demanding still more resources.

It is time that Congress recognize that it must call a halt to our military involvement in Vietnam. It has the power to do so; namely, through the power of the purse.

Once again the request for funds for the prosecution of the Vietnam war presents us with an opportunity to redirect national policy and to end the death and destruction in Vietnam. I urge that that opportunity be utilized and that this request for supplemental appropriations be rejected until the funds for Southeast Asian military operations are eliminated.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the conference report on the second supplemental appropriations bill which is before us today.

While there is a good deal that is worthwhile in this bill—particularly the funds for further acquisition of the Redwood National Park and the additional \$90 million for the housing assistance interest subsidy programs. But there is a good deal to be concerned about, too.

I am especially concerned about the expenditure ceiling written into this bill. As you will recall, I introduced amendments on the House floor during the original consideration of this bill to exempt from the ceiling those uncontrollable expenditures which the Congress does not consider annually and which are based only on estimates in the budget. I moved to exempt these items from the ceiling in order to assure that other programs for which Congress had expressed its support in specific annual appropriations would not be cut back inadvertently. I was particularly fearful that if the budget underestimates ran as high as the \$6 billion low estimate in last year's budget, the social programs like health, education, job training, and the other antipoverty efforts would be reduced by a substantial amount, perhaps on the order of \$6 billion.

I am pleased to note that the Senate adopted my position with regard to the exemption of these uncontrollable items. I am less pleased to note that the conferees agreed to allow only very limited flexibility in connection with these uncontrollable expenses. The conference

has provided that \$2 billion in underestimates on uncontrollable items can be absorbed without requiring reductions in the other expenditures of the Federal Government.

My worry is that this \$2 billion is not enough flexibility. If the underestimates of last year were repeated this year, the \$2 billion leeway would certainly not be enough. It is for this reason, to protect our social programs from overruns in the uncontrollable programs, that I will again today vote against this expenditure ceiling.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I cast my vote against the second supplemental appropriation, 1969, out of conviction that this bill once again reflects the lack of concern for the real needs of this Nation.

We are appropriating an additional \$176 million for a Southeast Asia military operation, another \$265 million for Army personnel, \$267.6 million more for Air Force personnel.

As in the past, Mr. Speaker, my problem is not with any one part of this supplemental appropriations hodgepodge. My problem is that we have once again failed to assess our priorities. I am gravely concerned that the ceiling we have imposed will result in dollars being taken from the hide of our cities. Past experience demonstrates that, if expenditures are cut along the way, money will come from the social and economic programs so desperately needed to relieve our dying cities.

Any one or all of these appropriations may indeed be worthy. Certainly those appropriations which reflect the latest Federal pay raises are well-justified in the interest of maintaining the high caliber of Federal employees and making Government service attractive on a competitive basis with the private sector. I support the lifting of the foolish restrictions relating to the personnel levels of civilian Government employment.

Nonetheless, I find substantial sums of money appropriated which have not been carefully examined as to need, and which have not been assessed against programs which I regard as more urgent, very much more urgent for our Nation. I become more convinced every day that we need a fundamental and searching scrutiny of our existing programs in order to reallocate our resources where they are most needed. Our military expenditures could easily be pared by billions of dollars. We spend additional billions in support of agricultural programs designed to curb food production, while millions of Americans suffering from malnutrition pay too much for food stamps. Every day reports reach my office of budget cuts affecting our education system, our health programs, our employment programs. We still spend more on our space program than we do to improve the lot of our poor. Middle-class urban taxpayers find their tax load increasing rapidly and are being slowly starved for basic services—schools, garbage collection, recreation facilities, police protection.

I reject the concept that the quiet American must continue to be the victim of our failure to take stock, restate na-

tional goals and commitments, and recast priorities. More and more people are speaking out most eloquently against the inequities and unjustifiable burdens being imposed on all Americans, heedlessly and without analysis.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of the Congress is to listen thoughtfully and react in a responsive, responsible way. We have not really begun to hear the many voices of protest in today's America, from poor and middle class alike.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 348, nays 49, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

YEAS—348

Abbott	Chamberlain	Ford, Gerald R.
Abernethy	Chappell	Ford,
Adair	Clark	William D.
Adams	Clausen,	Foreman
Addabbo	Don H.	Fountain
Albert	Clawson, Del	Friedel
Alexander	Cleveland	Fulton, Pa.
Anderson,	Collins	Fulton, Tenn.
Tenn.	Colmer	Fuqua
Andrews, Ala.	Conable	Galifianakis
Annunzio	Conte	Gallagher
Arends	Corbett	Gaydos
Ayres	Coughlin	Gettys
Baring	Cowger	Gialimo
Barrett	Culver	Gibbons
Beall, Md.	Cunningham	Goldwater
Belcher	Daddario	Gonzalez
Bell, Calif.	Daniel, Va.	Goodling
Bennett	Daniels, N.J.	Gray
Betts	Davis, Wis.	Griffin
Bevill	de la Garza	Griffiths
Biaggi	Delaney	Grover
Blester	Dellenback	Gubser
Blanton	Denney	Gude
Blatnik	Dennis	Hagan
Boland	Dent	Haley
Bolling	Dickinson	Halpern
Brademas	Dingell	Hamilton
Brasco	Donohue	Hammer-
Bray	Dorn	schmidt
Brinkley	Dowdy	Hanley
Brock	Downing	Hanna
Brooks	Dulski	Hansen, Idaho
Broomfield	Duncan	Hansen, Wash.
Brotzman	Dwyer	Harvey
Brown, Mich.	Eckhardt	Hastings
Brown, Ohio	Edmondson	Hathaway
Broyhill, N.C.	Edwards, Ala.	Hays
Broyhill, Va.	Edwards, La.	Hébert
Buchanan	Ellberg	Hechler, W. Va.
Burke, Fla.	Erlenborn	Heckler, Mass.
Burke, Mass.	Esch	Henderson
Burleson, Tex.	Eshleman	Hicks
Burlison, Mo.	Evans, Colo.	Hogan
Burton, Utah	Fallon	Holifield
Bush	Fascell	Horton
Button	Feighan	Hosmer
Byrne, Pa.	Findley	Howard
Byrnes, Wis.	Fisher	Hull
Cabell	Flood	Hungate
Caffery	Flowers	Hunt
Carter	Flynt	Hutchinson
Casey	Foley	Ichord
Cederberg		Jarman
Celler		Johnson, Calif.

Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Tenn.
Kazen
Kee
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lowenstein
Lujan
Lukens
McCarthy
McClary
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Mollohan
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morgan
Morse

NAYS—49

Anderson, Calif.
Ashbrook
Bingham
Blackburn
Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Camp
Chisholm
Clancy
Clay
Cohelan
Conyers
Cramer
Dawson
Devine
Diggs

NOT VOTING—35

Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Ashley
Aspinall
Berry
Boggs
Bow
Cahill
Carey
Collier
Davis, Ga.

Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
Obcy
O'Hara
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Relfel
Reuss
Rhodes
Rlegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Ruth
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shipley

Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Wecker
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Winn
Wold
Wright
Wyatt
Wyder
Wyman
Yates
Yatron
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

Mr. Sisk with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Cahill.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Aspinall with Mrs. May.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Stratton.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Mann.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. McMillan.

Messrs. DEVINE, HARSHA, ROTH, THOMSON of Wisconsin, O'KONSKI, SCHADEBERG, AND DAWSON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider en bloc, amendments which are in technical disagreement and on which the managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur as follows: Nos. 4, 11, 13, 16, 27, 29, 31, 33, 38, 39, 43, 46, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 87, 91, and 92.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 3, line 18, insert:

"SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"FLOOD PREVENTION

"For an additional amount for 'Flood prevention', \$4,000,000 to remain available until expended for emergency measures for runoff retardation and soil erosion prevention, as provided by section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (33 U.S.C. 701 b-1)."

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 6, line 23, insert: "of which \$95,000 for the Department of Corrections shall remain available until September 30, 1969, and".

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 8, line 8, insert: "to be derived by transfer from appropriations for 'Economic Assistance', fiscal year 1969, of the Agency for International Development,".

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 9, line 16, insert: "of which \$100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 12, line 23, insert: "of which \$150,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 29: Page 13, line 17, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE TERRITORIES

"ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

"For an additional amount for 'Administration of territories', \$950,000, to remain available until expended."

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 14, line 2, insert:

"HEALTH AND SAFETY

"For an additional amount for 'Health and safety', \$750,000 to remain available until September 30, 1969."

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 14, line 21, insert: "of which \$250,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 15, line 18, insert: "of which \$460,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 16, line 6, insert: "prior to September 1, 1969".

Senate amendment No. 43: Page 19, line 5, insert: "to remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 46: Page 20, line 15, insert:

"SENATE

"For payment to Vide G. Bartlett, widow of E. L. Bartlett, late a Senator from the State of Alaska, \$30,000.

"The clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the States of Illinois and Texas shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of eleven million, the population of said States having exceeded eleven million inhabitants.

"For an additional amount for 'Inquiries and Investigations', fiscal year 1968, \$126,900."

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 22, line 12, insert: "of which \$40,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 22, after line 23, insert: "of which \$101,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 54: Page 23, line 17, insert: "of which \$162,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 55: Page 24, line 9, insert: "of which \$737,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 25, line 1, insert:

"ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"In addition to the amount made available in the appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1969, for retirement pay of commissioner officers and payments under the Retired Servicemen's Family Protection Plan, \$147,000 shall be available in that appropriation for such expenses."

Senate amendment No. 58: Page 26, line 14, insert: "of which \$205,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969."

Senate amendment No. 60: Page 25, line 18, insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel', fiscal year 1968, \$850,000."

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 27, line 3, insert: "of which \$10,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969;".

Senate amendment No. 87: Page 65, line 16, insert:

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation", (Release of \$4,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);".

Senate amendment No. 91: Page 73, line 9, insert:

"SEC. 503. Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-364, approved June 28, 1968), is hereby repealed."

Senate amendment No. 92: Page 73, line 12, insert:

"SEC. 504. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1969, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1969, or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: *Provided*, That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appropriations and authority for the fiscal year 1969 as well as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof."

Mr. MAHON (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Evans of Tennessee with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 4, 11, 13, 16, 27, 29, 31, 33, 38, 39, 43, 46, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 87, 91 and 92, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 5, line 7: insert "and in addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Procurement, Marine Corps'."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$500,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: On page 5, line 12, insert: "and in addition, \$3,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army'."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$1,500,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: On page 5, line 18, insert: "and in addition, \$5,377,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Other Procurement, Air Force'."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$2,000,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 40: On page 16, line 19, insert:

"MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

"MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, \$10,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1969."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "\$7,500,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: On page 17, line 11, strike out: "including payments authorized by section 108(b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as amended (Public Law 90-354, approved June 20, 1968), and annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), \$11,161,000, of which \$3,920,000 shall remain available until expended for said annual interest grants: *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from 'Community mental health resource support', Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act" and insert in lieu thereof "of which \$3,920,000 shall be for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968), to remain available until expended for said annual interest grants, \$360,000 which shall remain available until expended and shall be considered as interest earned on the sum authorized to be appropriated by section 108(b) of the District of Columbia Public Education Act, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 31-1608) and shall not be considered as an amount appropriated under such section, and \$16,000,000 shall be for educational opportunity grants under part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, to remain available through June 30, 1970: *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from 'Community mental health resource support', Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and proposed by said

amendment, insert the following: "\$3,920,000, to remain available until expended for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968): *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from 'Community mental health resource support', Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 90: On page 69, line 4, strike out:

"SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$192,900,000,000; *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted.

"(b) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter."

And insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$187,900,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount shall be increased or decreased by the aggregate amount by which the sum of expenditures and net lending in said fiscal year are greater than or lesser than the sum of expenditures and net lending in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for—

"(1) items designated 'Open-ended programs and fixed costs' in the table appearing on page 16 of the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-first Congress);

"(2) the item designated 'Special Southeast Asia support' in the table appearing on page 27 of that budget;

"(3) programs of aid to schools in federally impacted areas, under the Acts of September 23 and September 30, 1950 (U.S.C., chs. 13 and 19);

"(4) the programs to which title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 (Public Law 90-247) is applicable; and

"(5) the item designated 'Veterans benefits and services' in the table appearing on page 69 of the budget of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-first Congress): *Provided further*, That whenever action, or inaction by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations thereon, the Director of the Bureau

of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending, including the effect on the limitation set forth herein: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.

"(b) The President shall reserve from expenditure and net lending, from appropriations or other obligatory authority heretofore, herein, or hereafter made available, such amounts as may be necessary to effectuate the provisions of subsection (a).

"Such reservations by the President shall be in amounts sufficient to insure reductions of not less than \$1,900,000,000 in expenditures and net lending, below the amounts recommended in the April review of the 1970 Budget, for programs other than those designated in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (a).

"(c) In the administration of any program as to which—

"(1) the amount of expenditures or net lending is limited pursuant to subsection (a), and

"(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution, the amount available for expenditure or obligation (as determined by the President) shall be substituted, in the application of the formula, for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available.

"Expenditures by the Tennessee Valley Authority out of the proceeds from its power operations, from the sale of any power program assets, or from power revenue bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness shall not be subject to any limitations imposed by this title."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 401(a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$191,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations reflected in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget' appearing on pages E2993-2996 of the Congressional Record of April 16, 1969, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays), and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That net Congressional actions or inactions affecting expenditures and net lending reflected in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget'

shall not serve to reduce the foregoing of \$191,900,000,000 unless and until such actions or inactions result in a net reduction of \$1,000,000,000 below total expenditures and net lending estimated for 1970 in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget'.

"(b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) during the fiscal year 1970 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise under appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action by the Congress) appearing on page 16 of the budget for such fiscal year (H. Doc. 91-15, part 1, Ninety-first Congress), namely:

"(i) items designated 'Social security, Medicare, and other social insurance trust funds';

"(ii) the appropriation 'National service life insurance (trust fund)' included in the items designated 'Veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance';

"(iii) the item 'Interest'; and

"(iv) the item 'Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)'

will exceed the estimates included for such items in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget' referred to in subsection (a) hereof, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

"(2) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that receipts (credited against expenditures and net lending) during the fiscal year 1970 derived from:

"(i) sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans Administration, and the Small Business Administration; and

"(ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf will be less than the estimates included for such items in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget' referred to in subsection (a) hereof, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

"(3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not exceed \$2,000,000,000.

"(c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

OVERALL EXPENDITURE LIMITATION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the House passed this second supplemental appropriation bill on May 21, 1969. It passed the other body on June 16, 1969. The amendment now before us, amendment No. 90, was the amendment which held up the conference for some time. Let me explain the situation.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement establishing a comprehensive ceiling on Government spending for the current fiscal year 1970, is something of a landmark measure in the fiscal affairs of the Government. It breaks new ground. It establishes a precedent. It sets a basic pattern for the future.

For the first time, it places directly in

the hands of Congress the specific decision as to the maximum amount to be taken out of the Treasury for payment of the Government's bills in a given 12-month period.

Last year and the year before, Congress adopted spending ceilings of sorts but they were not all-encompassing. They were partial ceilings at best. Last year's ceiling exempted from its provisions about half of the spending total. And the Senate version of this year's ceiling was also only a partial ceiling; it too would have exempted over half of President Nixon's expenditure budget for fiscal 1970.

But we have not adopted the Senate version. We have adopted an all-encompassing provision that keeps the reins for regulating the annual spending rate in the hands of Congress.

We have adopted something very close to the pattern originally voted by the House.

With one limited exception which I shall describe, we have adopted a "floating" or continuously adjusting ceiling based on actions or inactions by the Congress that affect fiscal 1970 expenditures. This is patterned after the House version.

The statement of the managers explains the conference agreement in some detail and contrasts it with the House and Senate versions—and I shall insert the full text of it—but briefly, the conference agreement differs in these respects:

The expenditure ceiling was set by the conferees at \$19.9 billion, \$1 billion below the amount in the administration's April 15 revised budget. The House bill made no reduction; it was directed primarily to securing focus on and ceiling control of all spending, not primarily to expenditure reduction.

The conference agreement includes the language in the House version which provides for varying the ceiling based on congressional actions or inactions on the budget. Any reductions made by Congress in its individual actions or inactions on the budget would count toward the \$1 billion cut.

The Senate version of the expenditure limitation would have exempted from congressional ceiling control about \$111 billion of the \$192.9 billion spending budget, and would have imposed a reduction of at least \$1.9 billion against the remaining \$81 billion.

The conference agreement exempts nothing from the ceiling where Congress annually acts on the specific budget requests, but does provide a cushion of not to exceed \$2 billion to meet unforeseen increases in a handful of items—such as interest on the public debt, social security, and so forth—where annual action to authorize the expenditures is not required by Congress. In such instances, the President would have to notify Congress of any determinations to draw against this cushion for such administratively uncontrollable expenditures.

The revised budget of April 15 classifies about \$100 billion of the \$192.9 billion expenditure total for fiscal 1970 as relatively uncontrollable civilian program expenditures under existing law,

but several items in this classification are not permitted to be charged to the \$2 billion cushion.

So, Mr. Speaker, it would be possible for the Government to spend more than the ceiling of \$191.9 billion if Congress authorizes and appropriates additional funds or otherwise takes actions or fails to take actions at variance with the budget. But regardless of what actions may be taken, at least \$1 billion must be reduced. There must be a reduction of \$1 billion, according to the language now pending before us.

I would say the \$1 billion is a modest reduction. I had hoped that we could make a much larger reduction than \$1 billion. I am speaking now in terms of expenditures and not in terms of appropriations.

Last year; that is, fiscal 1969, in terms of appropriations, we cut about \$13 billion from the budget and in terms of spending we cut, jointly with the executive branch, about \$6 billion in the non-exempted areas. But overruns in the exempted areas wiped out the \$6 billion.

However, the budget with which we are confronted this year presents a difficult problem, but we thought that under the circumstances we could afford to agree to the \$1 billion reduction, hoping, of course, that the Congress through its efforts on the various appropriation bills and other bills will be able to make reductions substantially greater than \$1 billion—certainly at least the \$1 billion—which is specifically mandated.

But the main objective of the conferees on the part of the House, consistent with the original House version, was to fix an overall expenditure limitation in Government, Government-wide, exempting nothing at all. To reach agreement, we did provide a cushion, a latitude, of up to \$2 billion for a limited number of so-called uncontrollable items.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A \$1 billion reduction from what?

Mr. MAHON. A \$1 billion reduction from the \$192.9 billion submission of President Nixon on April 15, 1969, relating to fiscal 1970 budget outlays.

It should be borne in mind that Mr. Nixon himself in submitting his budget increased the Johnson budget for so-called uncontrollables but reduced the Johnson budget for controllables. So this is the figure from which we operate, from the \$192.9 billion.

Mr. GROSS. But it gives the President \$2 billion of so-called flexibility; is that correct? Would that be above the \$191.9 billion?

Mr. MAHON. It could be, but only for such things as interest on the national debt, social security, and several others, which are uncontrollable through the normal appropriations process. The specific list is in the pending motion.

Mr. GROSS. This sounds like fiscal legerdemain to me, to say that Congress is going to cut \$1 billion and then give the President the flexibility to go up \$2 billion.

Mr. MAHON. The flexibility applies only to a limited number of items which do not require annual action by the Congress and which cannot be controlled by the President, such as the interest on the public debt, social security, and other items which are enumerated. These are fixed in various basic laws.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. On this point, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be noted for the RECORD that the bill when it left the House did not contain any exemptions. The Senate bill contained many exemptions.

Mr. MAHON. The Senate exempted from control about \$111 billion out of the \$192.9 billion spending budget. And it exempted many more items than are included in the conference exemption list now under consideration. And it did not put any dollar limit on the exemptions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman the amount of the so-called uncontrollables? The gentleman is talking about the interest payment on the Federal debt, the social security payments, and so forth and so on, but what else?

Mr. MAHON. Under the Senate version of the bill the so-called uncontrollables were calculated to be about \$111 billion.

Mr. GROSS. About \$111 billion?

Mr. MAHON. About \$111 billion.

Mr. GROSS. That still leaves, it would appear to me, a lot of latitude in which to cut when you talk in terms of \$111 billion on the one hand, and \$191.9 billion on the other. Congress certainly has a lot of room to cut if it wants to.

Mr. MAHON. Congress can work its will. Whatever Congress does today it can undo tomorrow, of course. But the gentleman asked about the uncontrollables that were established by the other body. For example, \$25.2 billion was exempted for the war in Southeast Asia. That is not exempted in this conference agreement. Other uncontrollables include some \$42 billion for the social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds. Interest is \$16 billion, plus, which is considered an uncontrollable. There are others in the Senate exemption list.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED) estimated several weeks ago that it would require some \$17.3 billion this year for the interest payment on the Federal debt alone.

Mr. MAHON. I do not believe there is any doubt but what the President would have to utilize a considerable part of the \$2 billion cushion in order to meet the interest acceleration on the public debt.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will bear with me for just 30 seconds, I would like to add that I regret that the committee acceded to any such exemption as this. The House bill prop-

erly provided no exceptions or exemptions, as far as I know. I am sorry that the conference did this. I know of no reason why the President of the United States should have this \$2 billion play, this flexibility of \$2 billion.

Mr. MAHON. I will have to say, as the gentleman well knows, that in a conference you do the best you can. I believe we did reasonably well in eliminating several of the exemptions which had been provided.

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman will agree with me that we have seen too often the results of this body giving Presidents the authority to put something into effect if they deem it to be in the national interest. I am opposed to giving this kind of power to the executive branch of the Government, this kind of flexibility.

Mr. MAHON. I was satisfied with the original House version, and much of that version is retained in the conference agreement in the sense that we have a total ceiling on Government spending, which was an important objective.

Mr. Speaker, may I add that over the long stretch of time, covering all administrations of both parties, and for a variety of reasons, there have been great variations between original budget projections of expenditures—not appropriations, but expenditures—for the forthcoming fiscal year and what was actually expended in that year. Original budget estimates of spending simply have a way of not proving out, of missing the mark.

Sometimes, that is due in part to over-optimism.

Sometimes, it is due in part to a natural and understandable desire on the part of the executive branch to put its best budgetary foot forward and project the fiscal outlook as favorably as possible.

Sometimes, it is due in part to unforeseen, even unforeseeable requirements for necessary or mandated programs of government.

And, of course, the outcome is to some extent influenced by the actions of the Congress or inactions by the Congress on budget recommendations.

In short, it is a shared responsibility, but I believe it entirely fair to say that all administrations have tended to shade the projected spending total on the low side. This is not a partisan matter at all. It is simply a condition that exists regardless of party or person.

Let me be specific:

Taking all 14 budgets for the post-Korea fiscal years 1955 through 1968, the projected expenditure totals in the original annual budgets were cumulatively exceeded by about \$50 billion. In 11 of the 14 years, the overruns aggregated \$53.3 billion. In 3 years, there were underruns aggregating \$3.5 billion. But overall for the 14 years, the Government actually expended—for a variety of reasons—about \$50 billion more than the sum total of what was projected in the original budgets. That averages to about \$3.4 billion a year.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why the original House provision held significant poten-

tial for savings if it had been adopted and adhered to.

Taking those 14 budgets by administrations, the first seven, from 1955 through 1961, were under the Eisenhower administration. The net overrun for the 7 years, comparing actual spending to the original budget projection, was about \$17 billion.

The 3 years 1962-64 were under the Kennedy administration, and in those 3 years the net overrun was \$6 billion.

The 4 years 1965-68 under the Johnson administration show a net overrun of nearly \$27 billion.

The Nixon administration is, I feel certain, going to show an overrun for 1970, but it is too early to speak more precisely on this point.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we did not in the conference get exactly the House version, I do say we have its main features:

The ceiling is all-encompassing.

We are putting the spotlight, the focus, on total spending in a given 12-month period. The focus is on control of the rate in the spending of appropriations.

We are taking something of a step akin to the 1946 legislative budget idea which never worked and fell by the wayside.

Of course, Congress controls all spending now. It does so through voting appropriations and other forms of spending authority. But as Members know, not all appropriations voted for a particular year are spent in that same year. Thus the Government accumulates carryover balances unexpended. Under the new budget concept now in use, which embraces all the trust funds as well as Federal funds, the carryovers are now about \$226 billion—social security, pipeline funds for defense procurement, and all the rest.

The conference agreement places a regulating ceiling on the rate, the amount that can be paid out from both unexpended carryovers and from new appropriations voted for fiscal 1970.

So, Mr. Speaker, if I were writing an open letter to the administration—any administration, Republican or Democrat—I would express the hope that this comprehensive spending ceiling, which focuses on the totality of budget spending, will lead to more realistic expenditure estimates in future budgets. It is in the public interest, it is in the interest of better understanding by all concerned, if we can have before us—if the Congress, the press, and the country can have before them the most accurate and realistic estimates possible. And to repeat, I express the hope that adoption of this provision will lead to better budgeting and a greater awareness in Congress and the country generally of the totality of Government spending.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. We had at least four or five sessions on this conference. We were in session 2 or 3 days before the last recess. We did not agree to this

conference report without making an effort to eliminate all of the exceptions. But as the gentleman from Texas has already pointed out, anyone who has served on a conference committee with the representatives of an equal body knows that there must be some give and take. This was the best we could do.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to endorse what the gentleman said about this being a sort of a landmark in legislative history. I do not know of any other time since I have been here that a real serious effort has been made by Congress to regain control of the purse strings. We control the purse in a fashion, because it is true that the President cannot spend any money that Congress does not first appropriate. But we know that some of the funds we appropriate in a given year are spent over several years in the future.

In the spending program for this year, for example, the President draws to some considerable extent on funds that were appropriated in prior years. That is clearly set forth in a table in the Budget in Brief to which I would like to draw to the attention of all Members who are interested in this subject.

It shows clearly that in the projected budget outlays for 1970, \$109 billion only will come out of the new budget authority granted by the Congress for the fiscal year 1970 and \$85.9 billion will come out of funds which were appropriated and were made available in prior years. I am using the January budget in brief.

It is worthy of note also, that of the funds we appropriate this year, some \$100,700,000,000 is projected to carry over for spending in future years.

As the gentleman from Texas has indicated, when the Executive has a pot containing about \$430-odd billion out of which he can draw funds for spending, there is not much of a way we can exercise any control over the amount of money that will be spent in a given year unless we impose a spending limitation. I think the overall spending limitation we are imposing, the objective we are achieving is worth having to agree to some limited provision for the so-called cushion, which is limited to a few so-called uncontrollable items.

For those who may contend that this is a meaningless exercise or that the reduction is not realistic, let me call attention to the fact that in the budget review made by the President of the January budget, there was a net reduction in projected budget outlays of \$2.4 billion. That is below the outlays projected by the previous administration in the budget last January for fiscal 1970. They first updated some of the January budget projections to make them more realistic, adding \$1.6 billion, then they reduced the updated figure by \$4 billion, giving the net cut of \$2.4 billion, and coming down to the \$192.9 billion total.

So, Mr. Speaker, this additional \$1 billion in the pending amendment, added to the \$2.4 billion, makes the total cut at this point \$3.4 billion from the January budget total of the outgoing administration.

I should add also that, of course, the administration is not happy with this provision. They would prefer no ceiling.

They felt that they had, in the review of the budget, cut what they could and felt that they had a realistic total. And the President has committed the administration to a policy of fiscal restraint.

But, Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have our independent responsibilities. It is for Congress to decide what shall be appropriated and what shall be spent. The pending provision will require a little more belt tightening. And if we will, we can achieve the billion-dollar cut in our actions on the various spending bills.

The conference agreement was the best we could do, and I think under the circumstances was the best that could be reasonably expected.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. As I understand the ceiling in this conference report, it differs from the ceiling adopted by the Congress last year in one particular respecting Southeast Asia.

The Southeast Asia appropriations last year were considered to be an uncontrollable item and, therefore, presumably not subject to the ceiling.

As I understand the provisions of this report, Southeast Asia is now considered a controllable item, in the same category as domestic programs, and therefore is different from the provision last year. Is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is entirely correct. The expenditures for the war are included in the ceiling, and are not exempted.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, so that the Record will be clear, under leave granted I am inserting the full text of the statement of the House managers attached to the conference report, explaining the conference agreement in respect to the overall limitation on Government spending.

Amendment No. 90: Reported in technical disagreement. A motion will be offered to insert a conference substitute for both the House and Senate versions. The Senate struck the House version.

The conference substitute will impose an overall ceiling on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Government during the fiscal year 1970. As agreed to by the conferees, the initial ceiling stated in the provision is \$191,900,000,000—or \$1,000,000,000 below the amount in the House bill and also \$1,000,000,000 below the revised projection of 1970 budget outlays announced by the President on April 12 and summarized in the review of the 1970 budget released April 15, and appearing in the Congressional Record of April 16, at pages E2993-E2996.

The conference agreement retains the House language that would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with the estimated budget outlay effect of specific congressional actions or inactions in appropriation bills or other bills having an impact on the April 15 budgetary proposals. The conferees have added language to this part of the provision to also make it clear that other actions by the Congress would operate to adjust the ceiling in like fashion. These budgetary and other actions would result in adjustments of the ceiling whether initiated by the President or by the Congress.

And language is included to provide that net reductions made through specific congressional actions or inactions in the various

spending bills will count toward the aforementioned \$1 billion expenditure reduction rather than being in addition to it.

The conference agreement makes two adjustments to the original House provision. One is the addition, as subsection (b), of a limited lump-sum exemption to the ceiling figure. This exemption would permit the President, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, to adjust the ceiling figure by an aggregate amount not exceeding \$2,000,000,000 in respect to variations in estimates for items enumerated in subsection (b) upon his determination that expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) for the enumerated items will vary from the estimates on which the \$192.9 billion April 15 executive budget projection is based. The enumerated items in all instances involve objects and programs for which the budget outlays arise out of appropriations or other authority, or relate to estimated receipts that operate to offset budget outlays, that do not require current action by the Congress—in other words, permanent appropriations or other spending authority contained in basic law, or actions or inactions that operate otherwise to determine budget outlays under the unified budget concept.

The other adjustment to the original House provision is the \$1 billion reduction. The House bill made no reduction; it was directed primarily to securing focus on and ceiling control of all spending, not primarily to expenditure reduction.

CONTRAST OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT WITH HOUSE AND SENATE VERSIONS

The House version is explained in considerable detail beginning on page 118 of House Report 91-252. The Senate committee version was modified in some particulars on the floor, but the basic thrust and key features of the Senate version are explained on page 47 of Senate Report 91-228. Briefly:

The House provision was all encompassing; it contained no exemptions. And it did not seek to make a blanket reduction in the projected budget outlay total. The thrust of the House provision was to put the control of total spending in the hands of Congress, adjustable only by the Congress.

The Senate provision, unlike the House provision, did not put a ceiling on total budget outlays. The Senate provision exempted from the ceiling over half of projected expenditures and net lending—about \$111.7 billion on the basis of currently estimated amounts. And the Senate provision would have imposed a reduction of at least \$1,900,000,000 in the nonexempted areas of the budget, that is, against areas involving budget outlays of about \$81.2 billion as projected in the April 15 review. It would, in turn, have fixed a firm statutory ceiling of \$79.3 billion on budget outlays in the nonexempted areas. In the exempted items, budget outlays could rise as high as the requirements were determined to be. The President would have to make the necessary reductions to the extent the Congress, through its budgetary actions during the session, did not achieve the \$1,900,000,000 figure.

The conference agreement would likewise require the President to make any reductions necessary to achieve the \$1,000,000,000 cut to the extent Congress, through its budgetary actions during the session, did not do so.

Since the conference agreement sets a comprehensive ceiling which would be continuously adjustable based on congressional actions or inactions on budgetary proposals whether initiated by the President or by the Congress and whether or not inside or outside the April 15 budget review totals, there is no necessity to exempt any area of the budget that Congress normally acts upon each year. Approval of supplemental appropriations to meet existing unbudgeted requirements would be the basis for a corre-

sponding adjustment in the ceiling on budget outlays.

But the situation is different where additional budget outlays—not contemplated in the April 15 budget review or found practicable within the \$191.9 billion ceiling figure—arise in respect to programs and items on which Congress does not act annually to supply the appropriation or other outlay authority. These are mainly the so-called permanent authorizations that each year automatically stem from various basic laws and thus are not acted upon in the annual bills. It is for a limited number of these instances—instances involving generally large sums and where it is difficult to make accurate projections—that the conferees have made provision, in subsection (b), for the President, if he finds it necessary and so notifies Congress, to allow the increased expenditures above the related estimates on which the \$192.9 billion April 15 budget was based. The conference agreement puts a dollar limit of \$2,000,000,000 on how far the President can go in so adjusting the ceiling.

The items in respect to which the Presidential adjusting authority could operate if found necessary are:

On page 16 of the budget:

(1) Items designated "Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds";

(2) The appropriation "National service life insurance (trust fund)" included in the items designated "Veterans' pensions, compensation, and insurance";

(3) The item "Interest"; and

(4) The item "Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)".

Decline of receipts (credited in the budget against expenditures and net lending) derived from—

(1) Sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans' Administration, and the Small Business Administration; and

(2) Leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Subsection (c) of the conference agreement retains the House provision in respect to periodic executive reports on the operation of the ceiling provision.

LIMITATION ON NUMBERS OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. Speaker, I should also add, as has been indicated, that in amendment 91, we agreed with the Senate provision repealing section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 which to some extent limited the number of civilian employees in the Government and generally placed limitations on filling of vacancies as they occurred.

While section 201 was adopted as part of an economizing measure, the weight of the evidence is clear that it has cost more than it has saved and is a very unworkable provision. In the circumstances, we agreed that it should be repealed. In order to make the record more clear on the basis for this action, I am including the full text of the conference report explanation.

Amendment No. 91: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the amendment of the Senate, repealing section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act which placed limitations on filling of vacancies in certain full-time permanent civilian positions in the Government and on the number of temporary and part-time employees in certain Government agencies.

In section 201 itself, and in subsequent enactments in the last session, Congress exempted from the limitations and restrictions about one-third of the Government's full-time permanent positions and about two-thirds of the Government's temporary and part-time positions.

While section 201 was adopted as part of an economizing measure, the conferees are agreed that its impact is, in some cases, contrary to efforts to economize. The weight of the evidence is clear: It has cost much more than it has saved, not only in cases where dollar losses through operation of the section can be identified and estimated, but also in many other less measurable instances through the introduction of imbalances and inefficiencies into day-to-day administration.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in costly overtime work.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in a large loss of internal revenue collections to the Treasury.

It has, according to the evidence, resulted in inefficient utilization of personnel.

Particulars in these respects are cited in House Reports 91-264 and 91-265, on the appropriation bills for the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, and Agriculture, and in Senate Report 91-228 on this second supplemental appropriation bill.

The Committee on Appropriations, because of the costly and impractical consequences of operations under section 201, is embarked on a suspension plan for every agency as the appropriation bills are reported. The House has already suspended section 201 with respect to the Departments of Treasury, Post Office, Agriculture, HUD, and many independent agencies during the fiscal year 1970. The motion to be offered would repeal the section altogether.

Congress will, of course, continue to control Federal employment through the traditional appropriations process by providing or withholding appropriations for salaries.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for correction of a printing error in the statement of the managers on the conference report for H.R. 11400 as it is set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8, 1969. In the third sentence of the third full paragraph appearing in the first column on page H5623, "\$191.9" should be corrected to read "192.9".

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the measure just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 101, today, a quorum call, I am re-

the path on which the two nations are now proceeding.

I believe that this is the interpretation which all of us would like to place on these remarks, remarks the Senator had every right to make. He is not speaking for the U.S. Government or the administration. He is speaking as one Senator. There are people who would agree with every word in his speech.

The intention in this country, on the part of every President we have had in our time, whether Democrat or Republican, is to bring down the curtain, to perforate it, to bring about a thaw in the cold war, to try to normalize in every way our relations with the Soviet Union. That was the policy of President Johnson, President Kennedy, and President Eisenhower before them, and it is certainly the policy today of President Nixon. I do not think anyone would say that President Nixon is naive about communism or the Soviet Union, or their intention or their capability. He is alert to all of that. He has been a lifetime student of the Communist movement.

On the other hand, President Nixon has taken the initiative and he has set the tone for this country and the hope for the country in saying:

Let us work toward these negotiations. We are willing to start them as of July 31, the end of this month.

Certainly he has full expectation that those talks will be underway very early in August.

I do not think any one of us could say that the Soviet Union will negotiate an agreement with us that is just in our interest and not in their interest. No one would believe that they would, or even, perhaps, should. We are not unaware of the fact that we cannot hope to have an agreement with the Soviet Union unless it also serves the Soviet interest.

We have a coincidence of interests. Faced with a coincidence of interests, we have the opportunity for agreements. That was how we achieved an agreement on Austria. That was how we achieved an agreement on the testing of atomic weapons. We had that same coincidence of interests when we agreed on a non-proliferation treaty. It is hoped that we will have many more bases of accord in the future.

I would simply say that there is no question in anyone's mind that we must have a credible deterrent. In this respect I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. He has indicated, and I would indicate, that a credible deterrent depends upon two principal factors: First, the power to retaliate against anyone who dares to strike against us and, second, the will to use that power; and let no nation have any question about either point, the first or the second. We have the power. We have the will to use that power if attacked and if the free world is endangered by any nation.

Having said that, I think we can carry on this debate on the military procurement bill before us.

I think the way we carry this debate on will be exceedingly important. It is important because the Nation is watching us. The Nation is divided on many

issues. People are settling these issues in different ways. We are going to settle this issue with reason, not emotion. We are going to resolve our differences because we are 100 men with this great responsibility in this Chamber, equally divided, roughly, on one very important part of the military procurement authorization bill. But we are going to approach this problem by trying to analyze it, look at the conditions, look at the adversary, or the potential adversary, and look at and weigh all the alternatives.

I would like to say that I think it is with great pride that all of us will have this debate led by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

I think we all have a good feeling about having that committee under his chairmanship, because he is a man of great intelligence, a man of utter fairness, as demonstrated time and again in his relationship to his colleagues, and a man of absolute integrity. It would be hard to fill the shoes, in this job, of Senator RUSSELL; but I think all of us, unanimously, including Senator RUSSELL himself, would feel that no one is better qualified; and in this instance, the national interest, the seniority system of the Senate, and the great ability of the distinguished Senator now holding the chairmanship all coincide.

I myself am very proud to have had the privilege, over the past 2½ years, of working with the Senator who will lead those who oppose the ABM deployment at this time. Senator COOPER, a distinguished Senator from a sister State of Illinois, has been a friend of mine for many years. I think he embodies the qualities which citizens want and deserve in their representatives. He is beloved in his own State; he is respected throughout the country. He is respected by every Member of this body, and by the President of the United States.

I have seen him study this issue as I have never seen anyone study any issue before. I have sat alongside him for well over a year now, as he has interrogated experts in the field of intelligence, the military field, and the appropriate scientific fields, to try to discover what the truth of this matter is.

He is a man of great judgment; and I think it is a remarkable thing that the battle will be headed by the two men probably best qualified to oppose each other. Each of them has come to a different conclusion after weighing the same set of facts. This is perhaps why the administration admitted, when they made the decision to go ahead with an ABM system, that it was a marginal decision.

It is a very difficult decision. We happen to think that we have the votes to win, and we will win in the effort to delay deployment, for a number of reasons; but we respect the judgment of those who take a different position than we do.

I should like to make a few comments that I put together this morning to answer, to a degree, the points that have been raised by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

The issue before the Senate regarding

the anti-ballistic missile system is between those who would start ABM deployment now and those who would continue research and development, testing, and evaluation to produce a more workable system than is now available if it should ever become necessary to deploy that system.

By continuing research, development, and testing, by not beginning deployment in the United States now, we can make the deployment decision later. That decision can be based on whether we can develop a system that will work and on what we learn of Soviet intentions at the forthcoming nuclear arms talks.

Proponents of starting ABM deployment now say it would strengthen the President's hand in talks with the Soviet Union. I would simply, respectfully, say that in my judgment this is hogwash.

The President will be in a strong position if the Congress orders continued testing, research, and development to make the now-vulnerable Safeguard system really effective. Hasty deployment of a highly vulnerable ABM system cannot possibly increase the credibility of our military defenses.

The Safeguard proposal for beginning deployment at sites in Montana and North Dakota will require early installation of today's vulnerable missile site radars—MSR's—and construction of ABM sites where realistic testing really cannot occur. It would freeze the system in an ineffective state.

It would make far more sense to redesign the radars, to test them at Kwajalein, and to deploy a full system out there where intercepts of nonnuclear missiles can be tested.

I am not a technician nor a scientist; but I was down here some 25 years ago as a procurement officer for the Navy. I spent some 25 years as a defense contractor. I have worked with the military over a period of many years, including 3 years in military service.

The situations I fear most, and the times I have gotten into the deepest trouble as an industrialist or as a procurement officer, have been when we rushed ahead with a system that was not yet ready for production. We invariably delayed, in the end, deployment or production. We delayed and frustrated the objective we were trying to achieve, in our haste to put into production something that was untested.

Proponents of immediate deployment contend that a year's delay will make it impossible to catch up with the proposed schedule of putting two sites in operation by the end of 1973 and making the whole system operational by 1975.

This is untrue. If we do not begin deployment now, but rather—and I for one would be willing—begin preproduction of long leadtime components, we can at relatively small cost start deployment—should it later appear advisable—a year from now and still meet the Pentagon's schedule.

In my dedication to the security and national interest of the United States—and I know that my dedication is matched by the dedication of every other Member of the U.S. Senate—I will support, and I know every other Senator will

support, whatever level of military spending seems required.

But I think the word "sufficiency," as used by the President of the United States, was one of the most significant words yet contributed to the vocabulary of this dialog.

I have not been convinced that deployment of the ABM will yield any net gain in national security. The fact is that this system in its present stage of design and development—even if approved by the Congress—will probably never be fully deployed because it has yet to be perfected as a weapons system. We need lose no time as we conduct arms talks with the Soviet Union, because we can use that time for development of less expensive, smaller radars which can be better defended than the present vulnerable design permits.

The main reason cited for ABM deployment is to deny the Soviets a preemptive first-strike capability. The fact is that it would be sheer lunacy for the Russians to attack the United States with nuclear weapons even without us having the ABM because:

First. The underwater Polaris fleet remains ready to strike a devastating response.

Second. At any time about 250 of our intercontinental bombers are on 10-minute alert, and their air-to-ground nuclear rockets would be part of the retaliatory strike.

Third. It is impossible that our entire Minuteman Titan force could be wiped out with one blow.

These are facts of which the biggest, rashest hawk in the Kremlin is well aware.

In order for the ABM to make sense, the Soviets would have to believe: First, they could with a sudden attack wipe out all our nuclear forces if we did not have it; and, second, our ABM would preserve enough of our nuclear forces intact to make any such Soviet attack suicidal.

However, the present ABM system is too vulnerable to provide such protection, and our overall missile forces are sufficiently protected to maintain a devastating second-strike capability without the ABM.

On the eve of the arms talks with the Soviet Union, let us continue—even accelerate—the research, development, and evaluation process. Let us also give ourselves a reasonable period of time to determine, in the words of Secretary of State Rogers:

If the Russians want to go out of the ABM business.

Then we can do the same same.

I urge that we do nothing that would in any way frustrate the success of these negotiations, nor do anything that would in any way appear to look cynically upon such negotiations, which I truly believe are in our common interest.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I want to commend the administration for its announcement today of a new 2-year offset arrangement with Germany to help defray U.S. military balance-of-payments

costs for maintaining U.S. troops in Germany. The new agreement goes a long way toward correcting the absolutely scandalous arrangements that have been concluded in recent years under which, on very short-term loans, at prevailing market rates of interest, we are paying interest on money to defend and to provide for the defense of Western Europe.

Speaking as one Senator, I think that those arrangements have been simply impossible to continue. And I think they would have imperiled our whole ability to support our level of forces in Europe.

The new 2-year offset arrangement is for \$1,513 million which represents around 80 percent of the total U.S. balance-of-payments costs in Germany. Sixty-one percent of the total offset will be in the form of purchases in the United States by Germany for a total of \$925 million. The other \$595 million will take the form of other financial transactions. The largest single other item is that Germany will buy \$250 million of U.S. Treasury bonds with a 10-year maturity at 3½ percent. This represents a considerable advance over past offset loans where interest rates were at prevailing market rates of interest. Even more important is that Germany is blocking interest on its past loans to the United States and leaving it in the U.S. Treasury. The \$32.5 million of interest will be applied to military purchases in the United States.

In addition, Germany is buying up \$118 million of Eximbank and Marshall Plan debts owed to the United States; is prepaying \$44 million of other German debts to the United States; and is setting up a special fund of \$150 million for German investment in the United States.

It is my understanding from the Under Secretary of the Treasury on the telephone this afternoon that that is the only part of the financial arrangement that will carry commercial interest rates.

This new agreement is a major step toward creating a sounder financial basis for U.S. expenditures in NATO in that it covers 80 percent of all our balance-of-payments expenses, primarily using purchases.

We must still strive for a 100-percent offset; an offset that involves only purchases and not loans. If loans are to be used, we must be absolved of any interest costs.

This is the principle that I was striving for when I presented a plan to the NATO North Atlantic Assembly in June for a multilateral automatic offset arrangement for all military expenditures within NATO. The principle is that no country should gain or lose on the military balance-of-payments account as a result of its commitment to the common defense of NATO.

The administration has taken a big step toward this goal, and I am encouraged that in the future we shall be able to arrive at an agreement that will automatically offset military expenditures 100 percent through the use of purchases in the United States. This would also eliminate the agonizing, and I would say disturbing, and some would say humiliating,

bilateral negotiations that endanger German-American relations.

As rapporteur—working chairman—of the Balance of Payments Subcommittee of NATO, I plan to continue my work toward this goal.

I know of no greater threat to the continuation of our current U.S. troop level in Europe than the balance-of-payments crisis that we face today. We must continue our efforts until we reach a total offset on our NATO military balance-of-payments account.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1969—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11400) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 8, 1969, p. H5620, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think we should have a short quorum call.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I agree. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may put in a brief quorum call without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the grand total of the budget estimates of new obligational authority considered in connection with this bill was \$4,814,305,334. The House version of the bill recommended \$3,783,212,766, and the Senate version of the bill recommended appropriations of \$4,459,669,644. The Senate will recall that subsequent to the House committee consideration of the bill, supplemental emergency requests submitted directly to the Senate amounted to a figure in excess of \$450 million. The final bill agreed to in conference is in the amount of \$4,352,357,644. This is a reduction under the total

budget estimates of \$461,947,690. The final bill is \$569,144,878 over the House bill and \$107,312,000 under the Senate bill. After the Senate has completed consideration of this conference report, it is my intention to ask unanimous consent to insert into the record a tabulation which will completely detail each item in the bill by listing the budget estimate, the House and Senate allowances for each item, and the final conference agreement.

Perhaps I should comment briefly on the rapid transit money which the Senate had inserted in the bill.

All down through the years, the House Committee on Appropriations has expressed the belief that there is a place for both a freeway system and a rapid transit system in the Capital City. Since 1962, a series of delays and obstacles to the construction of the authorized highway projects have occurred. I want to call to the Senate's attention what has transpired.

In 1966, the National Capital Planning Commission approved a balanced freeway system. This occurred after the House had acted on the District of Columbia appropriation bill for fiscal year 1967. The Senate added \$4,527,000 for the rapid transit system, and the House conferees receded and concurred in the Senate amendment. Subsequently, the Planning Commission repudiated its approval, and the newly created Department of Transportation entered into the picture to such an extent that the entire Interstate Highway System in the District of Columbia was blocked. Last year, the Congress enacted legislation in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968 directing that work commence on certain highway projects in the District. This directive has been stalemated through actions of the National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia City Council as well as the Department of Transportation. The various delays since 1962 have caused highway projects which had undergone the complete appropriations process to be shunted aside so that the District has accumulated approximately \$200 million in funds that cannot be used. Furthermore, the Department of Highways and Traffic has expended about \$3,300,000 for preliminary engineering and design plans which have been discarded due to changes in planning and \$1,400,000 in plans held in abeyance, for a grand total of \$4,700,000 for design work that in all likelihood will not be used.

The House committee has continually stated each year that as soon as the highway program is allowed to proceed without recall they will recommend funds for rapid rail transit. They demonstrated this responsiveness in 1966 when there was a slight breakthrough and I am definitely of the opinion, from my meetings with the conferees on this bill and from my understanding of the current impasse that has developed, that there has been no change on the part of the House committee in respect to this matter. The Senate conferees, therefore, were forced to yield and the moneys were stricken.

Amendment No. 90 was the most controversial portion of the bill. Original language was inserted into the bill in the House, setting a limitation on fiscal year 1970 budget outlays. This original House language was stricken in the Senate and, as an alternative, a completely different approach was proposed. The final language agreed to, after a number of meetings between the House and Senate conferees, is a compromise of the positions of the two Houses.

The House provision as originally written set an overall expenditure ceiling for fiscal year 1970. Of significance is the fact that it contained no exemptions. The House provision also did not make an expenditure reduction in the projected budget outlay figures for fiscal year 1970.

On the other hand, the provision adopted by the Senate provided for an expenditure reduction in fiscal year 1970 of not less than \$1.9 billion. This reduction was to be made in the so-called controllable portion of the budget. The Senate provision exempted from any reduction the so-called uncontrollable items, and among these were funds for the financing of the war in South Vietnam. The Senate provision also contained a ceiling for fiscal year 1970, which could be adjusted upward for the items which are uncontrollable, such as interest, social security payments, and the like.

The language which has been agreed to in conference is a compromise between the proposals of the two Houses. At this point, I would like to say that I personally preferred the Senate provision since it effected a reduction in the new budget of President Nixon of not less than \$1.9 billion, and I fail to see why such a reduction could not be made in the face of a request to the Congress to continue the surtax. However, my personal views did not prevail in the conference, and the language which has been agreed to—which sets an expenditure ceiling of \$191.9 billion—also provides that that ceiling will be adjusted, upward or downward, as a result of congressional actions or inactions on budgetary proposals, whether initiated by the President or by Congress, and whether or not the expenditures were included in the budget review of April 15. This means that although there will be a reduction of \$1 billion in expenditures, this does not necessarily mean that the President's budget will be reduced \$1 billion. The President's budget may be adjusted upward as a result of actions or inactions by Congress, and although a \$1 billion reduction will ultimately be effected from the total expenditures finalized by Congress, such authorized expenditures may exceed, in the controllable area, the budget figures proposed by President Nixon in the April review.

The compromise language exempts from the imposed ceiling—to the extent of \$2 billion—increases in such uncontrollable items as social security, veterans' life insurance, interest, farm price supports, and certain items where receipts may be less than anticipated in the budget.

Mr. President, the best that can be said for the compromise language is that it

does set a ceiling on expenditures, which must be periodically adjusted based upon the action or inaction of Congress and the \$2 billion to which I referred; and, in addition, it does effect a reduction of \$1 billion under some figure which is not known at the present time because of the actions or inactions of Congress. As I said before, I did not favor this compromise language. I favored the Senate amendment. Mr. President, I believe that this compromise language will serve to provide a reduction in overall Federal expenditures, which is what I understood the will of the Senate to be.

Mr. President, I now wish to express appreciation to the other conferees who worked so diligently, so faithfully, and so patiently, and upon whom I had to lean for support and encouragement. Especially do I wish to express my appreciation to the ranking minority member, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT).

I invite attention to the fact that this bill was in conference from June 25 until July 8. We had several meetings, and of course the conferees tried to uphold the position of the Senate in all matters. But, as Senators know, there must be a spirit of give and take in such conferences; and the Senate, of course, had to yield on some items and the House receded on others. I feel that in the main this is an excellent conference report, particularly with respect to the money items therein.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I concur with the distinguished chairman of our conference in his feeling that, dealing with the money items, the conference was a very fair and equitable conference and that in the main the Senate action prevailed.

I share with him, however, disappointment in the fact that the Senate language on a limitation of expenditures was thought to be thoroughly unacceptable so far as the House members were concerned, and we could not move them a single inch in our direction.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I do not think that is quite the case. I think they moved several inches in our direction, but we also had to move several inches in their direction.

Mr. MUNDT. But not as far as the basic philosophy of the Senate language was concerned, which was largely the brainchild of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. We, on the Senate side, had worked out a very firm commitment on the part of Congress for some actual savings in expenditure.

I really am disappointed in the final result. It is better, I agree with the Senator, then the House language previously enacted. But I would be less than candid with my colleagues in the Senate and the House if I did not call attention to the fact that the basic language as finally adopted retains the earlier language of the House, which has an escape hatch so wide that a nearsighted farmer could drive a full load of alfalfa through it without touching either gatepost. I want to read it to you because the Senate

should be advised of that. It is on page 11 of the conference report on behalf of the managers of the House.

At this point I pause long enough to say that I continue to regret that the Reorganization Act of Congress, passed by the Senate a year ago, has not been approved by the House, because among other reforms it provided that the U.S. Senate and its membership would also get a conference report prepared on behalf of the managers of the bill on the part of the Senate. It has always rankled me a little to have to rely entirely upon the description and the analysis of the conference action as viewed exclusively by the Members of the House. Our conferees come to the Senate time after time emptyhanded, with no written report as to what transpired and as a consequence very few Senators ever get a completely clear picture of the conference action. This is a weakness in our system which should be corrected.

I now wish to read the escape-hatch language, because I am afraid it will not result in the kind of economies which we hoped might flow from this effort. This appears on page 11 of the conference report on behalf of the managers of the House:

The conference agreement retains the House language that would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate to comport with the estimated budget outlay effect of specific congressional actions or inactions in appropriation bills or other bills having an impact on the April 15 budgetary proposals. The conferees have added language to this part of the provision to also make it clear that other actions by the Congress would operate to adjust the ceiling in like fashion. These budgetary and other actions would result in adjustments of the ceiling whether initiated by the President or by the Congress.

Once that language is included in any so-called spending limitation formula, Mr. President, we have the phenomenon of a moving ceiling that moves up or down according to the action by Congress on the various appropriation bills. I submit that in reality that, kind of moving ceiling has very little advantage compared with no ceiling at all. To all intents and purposes, this so-called ceiling on spending would work as well, as suppose, if we had not used a figure of some \$191 billion, but had used instead the figure \$19 billion, the ceiling will move up automatically any time we go beyond it anyhow. I say that because I share with my colleagues in the Senate and House the inspiration that induced us to make a noble effort to write a legitimate, tight ceiling on expenditures to help squelch the fierce fires of inflation.

The House Committee on Appropriations felt, and we on our side felt, that instead of having the matter handled as was done last year, by the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance, which wrote in their concept of expenditure ceilings and employment ceilings, we would undertake the job in our appropriation committees. In my opinion, we pretty badly failed. I do not know whether the House Committee on Ways and Means could have had any better luck in approaching this matter. However, insofar as I am concerned, I openly invite the

members of the Committee on Ways and Means and the members of the Committee on Finance, if they feel inclined to do so, to take a whack at it. We found it was a most difficult thing to do.

We tried, on both sides of the Capitol, to do a responsible job. I think we largely failed. Because I think we largely failed, I think the invitation has to be extended to all concerned to evolve some ingenious method to accomplish the results which we desire, that is, a reduction in expenditures which will enable us, after having passed the necessary tax legislation, to make some dent in the battle against inflation.

Certainly I shall welcome any wisdom that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance can write into legislation, or any formula they can conceive of, which will achieve results.

So far as I am concerned, I have very little confidence in the efficacy of a moving ceiling. It is like a moving target. It is an elusive thing. We did not have that fluctuating feature in the Senate bill, I might add.

Of course, Congress can always spend more than is provided by some arbitrary ceiling which it fixes for itself, but under our Senate language it has to go through the painful, obvious, well publicized process of specifically exempting increased expenditures from the ceiling limitation. This will not now be necessary under the House language. It will simply be automatic—after the fact. For the next few days, the computing machines, the analysts, the economists, and the master mathematicians of the two bodies will figure out what impact this action will have on the moving ceiling. They will then have a new dollar figure for a ceiling, one which will go up or down each time Congress acts on money bills. I do not think that is an adequate answer to our serious problem. It was the best we could do in conference, unfortunately. Certainly we tried valiantly to uphold the Senate position, but we failed.

Mr. President, except for that failure I think that the remainder of the conference report certainly merits the approval of the Senate, and there is nothing we can do to correct this situation here.

Therefore, I shall vote for the adoption of the conference report, as I agreed to sign it. It is the best we can bring about because of the inability to get anything better between the two appropriation committees.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think this is a rare occasion. I am doubtful that I have seen anything like this in a long time where two Senators who labored so long, and I think so effectively, in creating this bill are so modest about their attainment. I think they attained a great deal. Beginning in April, there were long and painful hearings. They presented the bill splendidly on the floor of the Senate, where it was agreed to. Then, it went to conference. I am not at all of the feeling that they should be so modest in describing the result of their efforts, which I think have been largely successful. I compliment them.

Anyone who inspects this RECORD will find that there were 92 amendments in conference and, in the main, the Senate prevailed in conference.

The second point I wish to make is that I think the concept of the control of expenditures begun in the Committee on Appropriations in the other body this year and carried forward here is a very fine one and should be a part of the appropriations process of the two Houses, rather than to come as it did last year from the exhaustive and very fine efforts of the two Senators—and it was a bipartisan effort—who are members of the Committee on Finance. So the final effort to control expenditures which, in many respects was successful last year, was really the product of the tax raising committee rather than the tax spending committees, as it should be.

I am not at all of the feeling of my distinguished friends about the provision for control of expenditures. As weak as they think it is, I think it is an improvement over the House version.

When the Senator from Rhode Island called attention to the manifest weaknesses, and the conference included the amendments to meet his views, they materially strengthened the measure.

So far as the question of a moving ceiling is concerned, that is what it was last year, and that is what it is always going to be unless the Senate and the House enact this control measure the very last day of the session.

In this instance, we enacted it before any annual appropriation bill had been called up, and I think that is the time to enact it; but by being enacted at that time it has to contain machinery to reflect the actions of Congress for the remainder of the session on annual appropriation bills.

I cite just one instance and that is with respect to the food stamp appropriation where the Senate wrote into the bill the other day an increase of \$410 million for availability in fiscal year 1970. Under the provision in the final version of the expenditure control features of the conference bill whatever will be reported by the Bureau of the Budget in the way of expenditures in fiscal year 1970 out of the \$410 million, if it be enacted in the Agriculture appropriation bill, will serve to increase the new ceiling. It will be the action of the Congress and the representatives of the people and it should not be ignored or taken out by the Bureau of the Budget or the Executive after we get away from here.

As far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he thinks that a fine service has been rendered in that particular part of the conference bill and that the conference bill reflects the excellent and effective work of the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from South Dakota. The Senator from Florida does not like to hear them downgrade themselves or their service. He is here to pay tribute to them as having done a fine job and he is sorry they could not accomplish everything they described, but who has ever been able to do that in the Congress. After all, we consist of a good many people, 100 Senators and 435 Representatives. When one gets through with a conference it is certain to reflect

the views of the two able Senators who struggled hard on a bill such as this one.

I congratulate the Senators. This is a good conference report and a good bill. As one who has seen every phase during the creation of a bill and who has participated in a modest way, I do not want to see my friends disregard the credit I think they are due and which I am willing to give them at this time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I appreciate the very generous and gracious remarks made by the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND). I cannot express enough appreciation for the support he gave me in conference and the work he rendered, and the efforts he put forth to help bring back a good conference report.

I do share the feeling of the Senator from South Dakota to the effect that the moving ceiling pretty much knocks out any suggestion of any real bona fide reduction in Federal expenditures insofar as the conference report is concerned. We have been successful in requiring a \$1 billion reduction in some figure. We do not know what that "some" figure is and we will not know until all the figures are in. But it was the best we could do. Moreover, any increase in uncontrollables over the \$2 billion cushion may result in a forced offsetting reduction in expenditures elsewhere.

I cannot reconcile myself to the idea of having the Congress extend the surtax to permit the Government to tax the people and siphon off more moneys to be spent in turn by the Government on new programs.

But that is what we are being asked to do. We are being asked to extend the surtax. We should be willing to tighten our belts and curtail a few of the expenditures if we are going to continue to saddle the burden on the American people of a 10-percent surcharge throughout the remainder of the calendar year and 5 percent thereafter until June 30 of next year. I regret that the conference report does not show a determination at this time to enforce expenditure cuts. It does not make sense to me.

I think we must all agree that one of the major factors contributing toward inflation in this country is the gigantic expenditure of Federal moneys. Yet, what we are apparently going to see is the extension of a surtax which will draw more money from the pockets of the taxpayers while, at the same time, the Federal Government turns right around and spends more money on Federal programs. Such expenditures will fuel the fires of inflation. In other words, we are told that we must have the surtax to fight inflation. What it amounts to is simply that we will collect more money to fight inflation, and we will spend more money to feed inflation. It just does not make sense to me.

That is the position I take. I know that forced expenditure reductions would pinch my feet a little bit, too. Of course, I am going to try and increase appropriations over the budget estimates for certain items, such as public works projects in my State, but I was willing when I brought this bill to the Senate floor

in the first instance to accept offsetting reductions elsewhere for any appropriation increases in certain areas that the Congress might, in its wisdom, wish to make.

Of course, those offset reductions elsewhere might have evoked some complaints from me, too. But I think Congress should be willing to make some cuts in Federal expenditures, if we are going to extend the surtax. But, apparently, that is not the case. So we did the best we could in conference. As I say, we did not bring back a conference report which is entirely to my liking, but I cannot have it all my way. I think we possibly made some gains, but we also lost. However, I do appreciate the kind remarks of the Senator from Florida, and again I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to say to the Senator from Florida that I thank him for his generous comments. I would be ungracious if I did not express my appreciation for what he said. But it was not exactly out of a sense of humility that the Senator from West Virginia and I felt that we should "come clean" and point up this "escape hatch." We did so rather out of an abundance of caution when we felt that it plumb could not work and that we should so warn our colleagues.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think it is pretty much meaningless.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope we are wrong, but I do not want the Senator from Florida to think that we are the two humblest Members of the Senate. I do not suppose we are any more faithful disciples of Uriah Heep than anyone else in our closed society—and there are not many people in our Chamber winning prizes for modesty these days—but we feel we had to work out a formula that would work or describe to you the weaknesses of this substitute ceiling-fixing language as we see them.

The difference between a moving ceiling, which is as good as no ceiling at all—it is not any better, it is not any worse, but it kind of fools the people. I am afraid—but the difference between a moving ceiling and a fixed ceiling concept such as we had written in on the Senate side is this. We were to increase the food-stamp plan or some other expenditure with a fixed ceiling, we would have to have economies somewhere else along the rest of the year in order to get back that money and keep within the fixed ceiling.

The purpose of the ceiling is to compel Government to live within it. It compels us to economize. A moving ceiling does nothing. It would work as well, I suppose, if we had \$1 billion as a proposed ceiling. That would make headlines all over the country. The conferees put on a ceiling on expenditures of \$1 billion. However, if the Congress went beyond it, it would not be too important, there would be no confession of failure, because that ceiling—whatever it is—moves up and up automatically, while the people with the calculating machines are reporting back how much it had moved up and the dollar-figure involved

in the new and still temporary expenditure ceiling.

So, I hope we are wrong. I hope we get the economies. If we do, it will be a bill at a time, a vote at a time, and an amendment at a time, as the appropriation process unfolds. I do not think, however, we will get the needed economies by the machinations of a moving ceiling such as the House proposed and pushed through the conference.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I discussed this with the distinguished Senator. Under the House language, the ceiling that they put on would not apply to the educational appropriations. The subcommittee amended this to apply—the House knocked out the provision that we put in the Vocational Education Act last year that exempted all education appropriations from this ceiling. According to the House bill, they knocked out the House provision which would have repealed the prohibition against a ceiling on educational appropriations.

Congress passed the vocational educational amendments last year. My question is: Did the Senate prevail with that amendment?

I have read the language of the limitations on fiscal year 1970 budget outlays. Could the distinguished Senator indicate to me that the Senate did prevail? What are the facts about the educational appropriations? Do we have the status as it was before the House language which knocked out the language in the Vocational Education Act last year, or did the House prevail?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The House language in the original bill did not do what the Senator states.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. When it was debated in the Senate, no one contended that it did.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The House had no language in the bill limiting expenditures by the Office of Education. The Senate Appropriations Committee wrote the repealing language into the bill, but the Senate, at the urging of the distinguished Senator from Texas, and as a result largely of the efforts made by the Senator from Texas knocked out the language that had been written in by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, which would have repealed the law.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I want to thank the Senator for—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I want to emphasize that but for the Senator from Texas and his efforts, I think the language inserted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations would have stayed in the bill.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator for his—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I defended the committee's position on the floor, but the Senator's work was more effective than mine and he prevailed.

Now in answering the Senator's question—

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for one more comment?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, not at this time, but shortly. If I may just continue, because I want to allay the concern of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the Senator undid the work of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Consequently, that item was not in conference. The result is that the basic law, which was embraced in the education amendments of last year, I would say, largely because of the work of the Senator from Texas and the former Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse, is still the law.

In summation, the answer to the Senator's question is that expenditures of the Office of Education are not affected in any way by the conference report. Now I gladly yield to the able Senator.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I want to congratulate the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I serve on the committee with him. I am glad to be corrected. I had an error in my statement about the House. I commend the Senator's diligence. He knows exactly what is in the bill. I serve on that committee with him and he always has his homework done completely and has an exact knowledge of it. I want to commend him and thank him for his clarification which will relieve many people who have been worried about this question and asked me about it.

I want to say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that he gives me too much credit. Fifty Senators were working on that. I was only one of the instruments among all the half a hundred. I am very grateful to him for clarifying this matter.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Other Senators, including Mr. FELL, should have a great deal of credit, but I know I am right in saying that the Senator from Texas, (Mr. YARBOROUGH) did lead the fight. One day when I was very busily engaged in defending the committee's position with the respect to the expenditure limitation, he was lining up names of cosponsors for his amendment.

I pay tribute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I want to commend the Senator from West Virginia for his diligence but I would say it was not a case of who prevailed—I am certain he would not object to what is right, but I think wisdom prevailed rather than a humble servant on the committee, one of nine Senators. Many of us worked on it. As the Senator knows, no one man could have done it. It was a case of wisdom and the desire of the people to see education furthered in this country.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I have had the opportunity to discuss with my friend from West Virginia the fate of the \$16 million which the Senate restored in the supplemental for the program which is known as educational opportunity grants; so will the Senator yield for a comment or two as well as one or two questions which I would hope he would comment on, if I may?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the able junior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, first of all, I should like to add my understanding to that which has already been abundantly expressed about the difficulties and the heavy task of the Senator from West Virginia.

I know of no greater difficulty than to try to supervise an appropriation measure, to try to allocate limited funds within this body, unless it would be to allocate limited funds between this body and the other body. So my remarks—and I want to emphasize this—are not in any way directed at the Senator from West Virginia. Rather, if I may, I would like to direct these few words to our colleagues in the House. Each body is independent, of course.

I would like, as one Senator—and that is all I can speak for—to serve notice that, at a more propitious time than during the consideration of this supplemental appropriation bill at this late hour, I intend to do everything I can in my power—here again as one Senator—to see if we can reorient these priorities. I think they are out of kilter as far as that \$16 million for the education opportunities grants are concerned.

We wisely, of course, have given great consideration to the need for efficiency. It has been my experience, in a relatively short period of time, only 7 years, but 8 years prior to that time in the State legislature, to observe that everyone is in favor of efficiency until it comes to cutting one particular project that is of significant interest to the one who previously talked of efficiency. I recognize that. But when we look at the whole operation of the Federal function in the area of education, we have to reorient our priorities. We have to take a hard, realistic look at the times in which we live. We have to realize there are things going on on some of our campuses which cannot be tolerated or, frankly, excused.

I think the record will bear out my observation that these misdeeds are participated in by a relatively small percentage of our students, but, because of the great notoriety they have received, there is a reaction—I sense it in the country as well as in my own constituency in Indiana and other places—which threatens to disembowel our whole educational effort at the Federal level and threatens to turn back the clock in the effort in which many of us have participated, along with the Senator from West Virginia, to try to broaden the base for educational opportunities.

That is my judgment from talking to thousands of young people, not only in my State but throughout the country. The young people want to learn. They want to face up to the challenges. They are asking questions which perhaps we should have asked 10 or 20 years ago.

Some of them point out the inconsistencies between what some of us in the older generation say and what we do. One of these inconsistencies is pointed out very vividly in the insistence on the part of the House that the \$16 million of education opportunities grants be stricken from the conference report.

I allude to this inconsistency because, if there is one area that is fraught with controversy, it is the area of poverty. The whole area of guaranteed income, nega-

tive income tax, welfare, supplemental housing is a very hot potato. Yet there is one thing I have found no disagreement on. A person may be the most conservative person there is with respect to welfare, may be totally opposed to the Job Corps, but when it gets down to the fundamental question, there seems to be total agreement that the final solution to the problem of poverty is education.

I firmly believe that, although it is not quite that simple.

There is a total inconsistency in saying that education is the solution to the problem of poverty, and then striking out grants that are designed to permit unfortunate people who have been, through no fault of their own, born into families and environments that almost defy description, to have scholarship opportunities which would permit them to raise themselves by their own bootstraps and raise another generation in another environment with a better chance of being first-class Americans.

The Senator from West Virginia has been very indulgent, and I did not intend to get involved in this statement; but let me add that I have talked with officials at both private and State institutions in Indiana—and we have some very fine ones. Two weeks ago I had an opportunity to go to the Greensboro branch of the University of North Carolina and speak with a gentleman who is in charge of the educational assistance programs. He gave the same message that our education officials have been giving in the areas and schools where the dropout rate is high. We all know what happens to the youngster when he drops out. These officials have been giving the message to the poor and the underprivileged children, "Stick by your guns. Study. Stay in the classroom. Get your diploma. We are going to make it possible for you to get further training and get a college degree"—which is unheard of in many of these communities—"and have a whole new life for your family."

These children have stuck to programs like Upward Bound and others. They have stuck by their guns. Yet these people, both in North Carolina and in Indiana, and I imagine it is the same throughout the country, tell me that without this \$16 million we are not going to have enough funds to give scholarship grants to young people who have been in the Upward Bound program, let alone those who have not. It seems to me this is going to be a terribly disastrous thing. Not only will it be a loss of know-how and creative ability and a great humanitarian loss, but I suggest we are dealing with dynamite when we raise the expectations of these young people and say, "Here is a chance for you to have a better tomorrow," and then, when the time comes to cross the threshold, tell them that, because of the action of the House of Representatives, the door has been literally slammed in their faces.

I do not need to repeat the axiom we are all familiar with, that the future of America depends on our commitment to our educational needs of tomorrow.

So perhaps we ought to make an examination or reorient our priorities and see whether we should do more in the area of education. Education is not a

field in which we can cut back 1 year and make it up the next year. Each youngster who drops out of the education process has very little likelihood of getting back in. I not only suggest we need to continue the programs which we have undertaken to date, but, as far as investment of dollars is concerned, we have no better investment or way of doing a better job with our dollars. This is the key to the future.

I think some of us are going to do everything we can to see that the House of Representatives does not cause us to lose that key before we can take advantage of it.

I thank my friend from West Virginia for his indulgence. I know he did everything he could, but I think the House, in this instant, has been extremely shortsighted. I hope we can energize a force within this body to let the House know we mean business.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am very sympathetic to what the Senator from Indiana has just said. I was sympathetic to the item to which he has addressed his remarks. However, the conferees found the House to be adamant in its position.

I do not believe that the door, to paraphrase the Senator's words, has been slammed back in the faces of young people who want to receive an education. This is an ongoing program, and \$124,600,000 was allotted to the program after conference action on the 1969 regular appropriation bill. So, although it is true that it would have been desirable to have the additional \$16 million, I think we have to recognize that the 1970 appropriation will be coming along from the House at the end of this month, at least I would hope so. At that time, I am sure Senators will want to renew their efforts in behalf of this item by presenting to the appropriate subcommittee on appropriations—and it does not happen to be the one of which I am chairman—their viewpoints in support thereof.

I must point out that this item was not budgeted, and it is extremely difficult to take an unbudgeted item to conference and get the House to yield on the item.

I think the fact that it was not budgeted is largely responsible for our temporary defeat. It was not that the House conferees wanted to slam the door on anyone; it was simply that the House felt that if items are so necessary and needed, the executive branch ought to send up a budget request.

I would hope that those Senators who are interested in this item—and I am interested in it as well, though I was not one of those who led the fight for its inclusion in this bill; as a matter of fact, the suggested amendment came to our attention very late, we had no hearings on it, the House committee held no hearings, and as I have already stated there was no budget estimate, so we were at a great disadvantage in conference, in our attempt to prevail—will take encouragement from the realization that there was a very sizable amount of money appropriated in the 1969 appropriation bill, and undoubtedly there will be a considerable amount appropriated in the 1970 regular bill.

The battle is not wholly lost. I congratulate the Senator, and I commend the other Senators who joined with him in support of this item. They did a very fine job. I wish we could have prevailed in the conference.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further brief comment, although he has already, as I have stated before, been overly indulgent to me?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I know how hard the Senator tried on this matter, and I know that at this late hour, we are not going to do anything about it in this bill. I think the Senator's admonition to start looking now to the next bill is certainly what we must do.

But as we do that, I hope that we will recognize the responsibility that the legislative branch has to deal with the inequities that exist in the system, and not fall back on the fact that the executive branch downtown did not feel that this was important.

The large sum to which the Senator referred is there, it is true, but when you consider the number of scholarships, the NDEA program, the EOG program, the loan program—which is practically dried up because of the interest rate, though I and some other Senators have introduced a bill to try to free it—as far as providing resources for the young people who want to go ahead and get an education, this whole program has become really regressive, and it deeply concerns me. I am a bit despondent about it all. I am sure I shall feel better tomorrow, but not enough to lose my determination to hope we can do better.

What better investment is there than to give these young people the resources they need to expand their knowledge, intellects, and skills, so that they can help solve some of these problems the rest of us have not yet been able to solve?

I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Indiana for his helpful comments.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I share with the distinguished Senator from Indiana his appreciation of the task which the Senator from West Virginia has before him, in seeking to satisfy not only the Members of the Senate, but the conference committee as well, on a difficult supplemental appropriation bill such as this, involving, as I understand it, nearly \$4.3 billion.

I deeply regret, however, that this second supplemental appropriations bill did not include any of the \$16 million supplemental appropriation for the educational opportunity grant program which the original Senate version of the supplemental bill included.

This \$16 million supplemental for the EOG program, which the Appropriations Committee added to the Senate version of the bill, would have restored the money which last fall's conference committee on the Labor-Health, Education,

and Welfare appropriation cut from the original Senate appropriation for this program. It would have made 32,000 additional grants available for initial year EOG students, and prevented a severe reduction in the size of this program from occurring this fall. It would have kept faith both with our institutions of higher learning and with our disadvantaged students.

This is the second time, as I understand it, that the Senate has sought to include this \$16 million figure for the purpose of maintaining the level of initial year educational opportunity grants, and the second time it has been dropped by conference committees.

The net effect is that serious cutback in the initial year EOG grants that will be available. We funded educational opportunity grants for 123,000 initial year students in the first year of this program, the school year 1966-67; for 133,000 initial year students in the school year 1967-68; and for 140,000 initial-year students in 1968-69; but, because we failed to include this \$16 million, the figure this year will drop to 100,000 new students. Percentagewise, it is a substantial and severe cut. It involves denying the possibility of higher education to as many as 40,000 able young men and women in this country—young men and women who have the ability to go on to college, but, because of the financial gap which exists between them and the rising costs of a higher education, will be prevented from doing so.

Many of these young men and women have been approached through such Federal programs as Talent Search or Upward Bound. Many of them have been approached by the colleges and universities, have been identified as able young men and women, and have been encouraged to believe that they could afford to go to college through a combination of loans, grants, and work-study. The educational opportunities grants are essential; they are the foundation on which loans and work-study programs are built.

Several Senators wrote the full committee urging the inclusion of this \$16 million, which was included by the Committee in the Senate version of the bill. The Senate Appropriations Committee decision to restore this \$16 million was applauded in floor statements by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), and myself. And many other Senators, as the Senator from West Virginia knows, are most interested in it.

The reason for this interest and support is that very few programs have worked as successfully as the EOG. Very few programs have elicited the strong support of American educational institutions that this program has.

I do not have to remind the Senator from West Virginia that the cost of education is rising almost twice as fast as

the cost of living. It is now literally out of range for an estimated 700,000 able young men and women, who cannot afford to go on to college today because of the rising cost of education. Within 3 years, there will be 1,250,000 able young men and women who cannot afford to go on to college because of the rising cost of education.

This would have been the time, in my opinion, to substantially increase the educational opportunities grants program, so that we could take in an ever larger share of these able young men and women, and give them a chance to go on through college and contribute more effectively, not only to their own lives, but to the lives of their relatives, their neighborhoods, their States, and this Nation. Surely the experience we had with the GI bills ought to persuade us that this is not only right for these young men and women, but it is a good investment for the Nation.

The World War II GI bill of rights law has already repaid the Federal Government, and we have years and years to go with it. The Government is making a nice profit from the World War II bill of rights as well as from the other educational programs. That is why I find the loss of this \$16 million particularly grievous. I do not know how we can explain to these young men and women the kind of priorities we have.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator sought to include this additional funding. But we have before us a supplemental budget involving additional appropriations of \$4.3 billion, of which, I understand, about one-half is defense-related. We wanted to include \$16 million merely to maintain an existing program at a level nearly as great as it has been in the last 3 years. That may not mean much to us in the Senate, but it will profoundly affect the lives of 32,000 gifted young men and women.

I would hope that somehow we could develop a strategy to cause the House to understand the nature of this problem, and to do a far better job of enlisting their support, in some way, than we have thus far.

I am not being at all critical of the conferees, because I appreciate their difficulties, which we have already discussed.

Perhaps this problem was best expressed in the words of the president of the University of Minnesota, Malcolm Moos, who said:

Such federal cutbacks jeopardize not only our work with low income students presently at the university, but also our future recruitment programs. In addition, these cutbacks create hardships for the student group least able to cope with them, and may well increase campus tensions as institutions are unable to assist our economically deprived.

As the Senator from West Virginia understands, this issue will arise again in the regular budget-making process before the appropriate subcommittee. I wish it to be known that I shall do all I can to make the realities of this program, the compelling need for this program, the basic commonsense and justice underlying it, known in the Senate and known before the appropriate com-

mittee, because I feel there are few things that Congress can do now that will go further, that will help more, than constitute a better investment, than the educational opportunity grant program.

Reductions in educational investments are simply false economies. I believe that the conference committee decision not to include any supplemental for the educational opportunity grant program was a serious mistake, just as I believe the administration's proposed budget reductions in education programs for fiscal year 1970 are serious mistakes. I am disappointed that this effort to keep the educational opportunity grant program operating at a steady level has been unsuccessful, and I pledge my support for efforts to assure that important programs of Federal aid to education—from preschool education to elementary and secondary, higher education and adult education—are funded at a fuller and more adequate level in fiscal year 1970.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I am only sorry that I do not possess the eloquence of the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Indiana; otherwise, we might have prevailed in conference.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. We were hoping that the Senator would prevail because of his greater eloquence.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first I join with the views of my colleagues on the Education Subcommittee and express also my desire to work with them.

I shall certainly do my utmost to have adequate funds inserted for the educational opportunity grants in the regular HEW bill and fight for them all of the way.

I would, however, at this moment like to thank the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD)—I have been waiting for some time to do this—and I should also like to thank the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), who has apparently left the Chamber momentarily, for following through as they did with respect to the matter of summer employment.

I think they did well to get \$7.5 million out of \$10 million. We should have had a very much larger allocation, but all we could get in the Senate was \$10 million. So, to come back from the conference with the House with 75 percent in a case in which they had nothing is a very fine achievement. I have been in those conferences and have fought very hard in them.

More than that, it gives me great gratification that an act of the Senate after debate and consideration is not just tossed off lightly.

The Senator from West Virginia told me that he had contended for this measure in conference as if it were his own. And he obviously did, or it would not have come out this way.

I do not think there is any finer tribute that a Senator can pay another Senator than to say to him: "You did what you would have done for your own amendment if it had carried in the Senate, and you did this on a matter on which you had some doubts. You took the amendment and said you would follow through on it, and you did."

Not only am I grateful—because that is not very important—but I also think the Senate will find itself with an extremely helpful, though small amount of money. It will be very critical at a time when I think it will be demonstrated that every drop of this kind of rain will fall on very barren soil.

I thank my colleague for everything he did, and especially for sticking so closely, so precisely, to what he told the Senate and what he told me he would do in respect to the matter.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it should be said that but for the efforts of the Senator from New York, I do not think we would have the \$7.5 million in the bill. It was not my intention originally to insert it. However, as a result of his unflagging diligence and work, I offered the substitute amendment which carried in the amount of \$10 million. The Senator is precisely correct in saying that, having done that, I fought for it hard in conference.

As a matter of fact, I think I felt a greater responsibility to contend for that amendment in conference than I would have felt had it been my own legislative brainchild, so to speak, from the beginning.

So the Senator, I think, can feel very good about it all. I have no hesitancy in saying frankly and candidly, as I have here, that whatever credit there may be due anent this item, the Senator from New York can really feel proud, because it is mostly due him. I support the Neighborhood Youth Corps type programs, but it was he who generated the climate and pressed the fight to include the funds.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, that is very kind of the Senator, but I still maintain what I have said. The Senator did it as if it were his own, and this is a very, very fine thing.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, initially, I commend the Senator from West Virginia and his fellow colleagues for their diligence and their relative success in the conference from which they have emerged.

There is an item, however, on which I think the conferees have been shortsighted.

For the benefit of the RECORD, I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia a question or two about that item.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, pursuant to land-grant authorization for Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute, the House appropriated \$7.24 million which the Senate did not see fit to leave in the bill after it came here. Am I correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, this money was programmed to be used in part by Federal City College for an extension land grant program and on the part of Washington Technical Institute for a vocational program and environmental science program, because these programs could not be expanded as programs otherwise.

The Senate agreed to an amendment on the floor which would have appropriated in the case of a \$7 million-plus endowment \$360,000 which would have enabled these two institutions to go forward with these programs. Am I correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senate did agree to a proposal, at the behest of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, to add the \$360,000.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, it is my understanding that in the conference the House felt it would not settle for anything other than the \$7.24 million endowment on its part. Am I correct?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The House expressed the viewpoint that if the Senate position prevailed, and the \$360,000 were allowed, the door would thereby be opened for continuing requests for a new and permanent program in subsequent years which requests, in the view of the House, would become larger each year than the amount which was originally inserted at the request of the Senator from Virginia.

The House was adamant in opposing the position of the Senate. The Senate conferees, I suppose largely at my suggestion, were firm in opposing the \$7.24 million inserted by the House.

It was my feeling that, in view of the fact that the item had come to the subcommittee in the form of a supplemental request and that the hearings themselves did not produce sufficient testimony on which to support the \$7 million figure, the budget request should come up again and go through the normal channels and go before the regular appropriations subcommittees in the two Houses handling the particular item, so that they might exercise their considered judgment thereon after eliciting whatever testimony they might be able to secure in justification thereof.

The result was that the House yielded insofar as the Senate position was concerned anent the \$7.2 million, and the Senate was forced to yield in connection with the smaller amount. The slate was wiped clean, and no money was included.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, implicit in what the Senator has said is that the House position was in substance that if any appropriation was to be made, they wanted it to be made for the endowment of \$7.24 million.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is again correct.

Mr. SPONG. I think the record should show that until the endowment is appropriated, and as a result of the lack of action by the conference, these two institutions for the time being will not be able to expand programs in nutrition, child care, consumer education, and other aspects of family living in the District of Columbia, as well as environmental science programs and mechanical arts programs of which I already have spoken.

I think the expansion of these programs, particularly in the District of Columbia, are vital at this time. I was glad to hear the Senator from West Virginia say that he felt that in the regular proceedings to take place before the proper Appropriations Committees, the entire \$7.24 million will again be considered.

But I feel that these programs should be expanded in the District. I think they are needed. I think we are shortsighted when we appropriate money for food stamps and food programs, without recognizing that nutrition, education, and these very expansion programs are necessary. I hope that Congress will see fit to provide for the full endowment in the 1970 budget.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for reviewing this matter with me.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to make one slight correction, not necessarily in the Senator's remarks, but perhaps in my own.

If I said that the item "will be considered" in the 1970 budget, I do not think that is a precise statement. I am not sure that it was included in fiscal year 1970 budget estimates that were sent to Congress by the President. I am just not knowledgeable in that regard. But if an estimate has not yet been sent up, the Senator can, of course, ask the President to send up such a request. If the President does not accede to that request, and if there is no budget estimate before the Congress for this item, the Senator can approach the Appropriations Committee in the Senate and ask that it insert the money.

May I say that I hold no particular prejudice against this item, and it will not come before my subcommittee, if it does come up in the regular 1970 request. I have no prejudice against this item, per se. I did not feel that it had been justified in the hearings. Perhaps that was partly my own fault; perhaps I should have asked for additional testimony on it.

Nevertheless, I have no doubt that the able Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) will continue in his efforts until he succeeds. I am sure he will do everything he possibly can, and I commend his on his unflagging devotion to this cause.

Mr. SPONG. I say to the Senator from West Virginia that upon reviewing the record of the testimony before the Senate subcommittee, I can only agree with him that there was a lack of proper information upon which the Senate should act. But the fact remains that this money in lieu of land has been authorized by virtue of the status of this college. These programs have been outlined and planned, and as a result of this, they cannot go forward, and they all badly need it. Whether through the endowment or otherwise, I shall continue wherever I can to see that something is done about it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I know the Senator will do that. I know he is disappointed at the action of the conferees, but I am confident that if this item can be justified, the Senator from Virginia will see that it is so justified.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If it should happen not to go before the regular subcommittees as a result of a budget estimate submitted, and if it should come again before this subcommittee during the fall, I can assure the Senator that there will be ample testimony taken on it; and the Senator from Virginia will

be given an opportunity to appear before my subcommittee and present the facts which he has been able to develop, and which reveal so much resourcefulness and effort on his part.

I commend him. He has temporarily lost a battle. But if I know my man, I think he will win the final and decisive battle when the time comes.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I urge that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$500,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$1,500,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$2,000,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$7,500,000".

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "\$3,920,000, to remain available until expended for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968): *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from 'Community mental health resource support,' Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 401 (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$191,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations reflected in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget' appearing on pages E2993-2996 of the Congressional Record

of April 16, 1969, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays), and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That net congressional actions or inactions affecting expenditures and net lending reflected in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget' shall not serve to reduce the foregoing limitation of \$191,900,000,000 unless and until such actions or inactions result in a net reduction of \$1,000,000,000 below total expenditures and net lending estimated for 1970 in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget'.

"(b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) during the fiscal year 1970 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise under appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action by the Congress) appearing on page 16 of the budget for such fiscal year (H. Doc. 91-15, part 1, Ninety-first Congress), namely:

"(i) items designated 'Social security, Med-

icare, and other social insurance trust funds';

"(ii) the appropriation 'National service life insurance (trust fund)' included in the items in the 'Review of the 1970 budget', pension, and insurance';

"(iii) the item 'Interest'; and

"(iv) the item 'Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)'

will exceed the estimates included for such items in the 'Review of the 1970 budget', referred to in subsection (a) hereof, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

"(2) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that receipts (credited against expenditures and net lending) during the fiscal year 1970 derived from:

"(1) sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans' Administration, and the Small Business Administration; and

"(ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf will be less than the estimates included for such items in the 'Review of the 1970 Budget' referred to in subsection (a) hereof, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

"(3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not exceed \$2,000,000,000.

"(c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 40, 42, and 90.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation which reflects the budget estimates, the House and Senate allowances, and the conference action on the amounts in the bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H.R. 11400)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE I—MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		
			House	Senate	Conference
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
91-94	Military personnel, Army	\$136, 200, 000	\$110, 000, 000	\$110, 000, 000	\$110, 000, 000
91-94	Military personnel, Navy	21, 500, 000	14, 500, 000	21, 500, 000	21, 500, 000
91-94	Military personnel, Air Force	146, 000, 000	115, 000, 000	146, 000, 000	146, 000, 000
Total, military personnel		303, 700, 000	239, 500, 000	277, 500, 000	277, 500, 000
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
91-94	Operation and maintenance, Army	144, 600, 000	96, 310, 000	96, 310, 000	96, 310, 000
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	24, 300, 000	15, 390, 000	15, 390, 000	15, 390, 000
	By transfer			(8, 910, 000)	
91-94	Operation and maintenance, Air Force	307, 300, 000	242, 700, 000	242, 700, 000	242, 700, 000
Total, operation and maintenance		476, 200, 000	354, 400, 000	354, 400, 000	354, 400, 000
	By transfer			(8, 910, 000)	
PROCUREMENT					
91-94	Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	717, 000, 000	640, 100, 000	640, 100, 000	640, 100, 000
Total, title I, military operations in Southeast Asia, Department of Defense, military		1, 496, 900, 000	1, 234, 000, 000	1, 272, 000, 000	1, 272, 000, 000
	By transfer			(8, 910, 000)	

TITLE II

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

91-94	Salaries and expenses	\$1, 400, 000	\$1, 400, 000	\$1, 400, 000	\$1, 400, 000
-------	-----------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

EXTENSION SERVICE

91-94	Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses	218, 000	218, 000	218, 000	218, 000
-------	---	----------	----------	----------	----------

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

S. Doc. 91-18	Flood prevention	4, 000, 000		4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000
---------------	------------------	-------------	--	-------------	-------------

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

91-50	Sugar Act program	7, 500, 000	7, 500, 000	7, 500, 000	7, 500, 000
-------	-------------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

	Emergency credit revolving fund		(Language)	(Language)	(Language)
--	---------------------------------	--	------------	------------	------------

	Total, chapter 1: New budget (obligational) authority	13, 118, 000	9, 118, 000	13, 118, 000	13, 118, 000
--	---	--------------	-------------	--------------	--------------

Footnotes at end of table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H.R. 11409)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference
			House	Senate	
CHAPTER II					
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY					
MILITARY PERSONNEL					
91-50	Reserve personnel, Navy	\$8,500,000	\$4,150,000	\$4,150,000	\$4,150,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(3,500,000)	(3,150,000)	(3,150,000)	(3,150,000)
91-94	Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	6,800,000	4,500,000	6,400,000	5,450,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(1,600,000)	(800,000)	(1,600,000)	(1,200,000)
91-50	Retired pay, Defense	175,000,000	175,000,000	175,000,000	175,000,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)
	Total, military personnel	190,300,000	183,650,000	185,550,000	184,600,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(18,100,000)	(16,950,000)	(17,750,000)	(17,350,000)
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE					
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Navy	26,100,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(26,100,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(20,000,000)
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	4,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
	By transfer			(1,000,000)	(500,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(4,600,000)	(3,600,000)	(3,600,000)	(3,600,000)
	By transfer			(1,000,000)	(500,000)
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	13,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
	By transfer			(3,000,000)	(1,500,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(7,600,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(6,000,000)
	By transfer			(1,600,000)	(800,000)
91-50	Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	15,682,000	8,800,000	8,800,000	8,800,000
	By transfer			(5,377,000)	(2,000,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above) budget authority	(6,682,000)	(5,200,000)	(5,200,000)	(5,200,000)
	Total, operation and maintenance	59,382,000	42,400,000	42,400,000	42,400,000
	By transfer			(9,377,000)	(4,000,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(44,982,000)	(34,800,000)	(34,800,000)	(34,800,000)
	By transfer			(2,600,000)	(1,300,000)
	Total, chapter II:				
	New budget (obligational) authority	249,682,000	226,050,000	227,950,000	227,000,000
	By transfer			(9,377,000)	(4,000,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(63,082,000)	(51,750,000)	(52,550,000)	(52,150,000)
	By transfer			(2,600,000)	(1,300,000)
CHAPTER III					
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
FEDERAL FUNDS					
91-50	Federal payment to the District of Columbia	11,000,000	10,365,000	10,365,000	10,365,000
91-50	Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay	18,736,000	Not considered	18,736,000	
	Total, Federal funds	29,736,000	10,365,000	29,101,000	10,365,000
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS					
91-50	General operating expenses	1,070,000	975,000	975,000	975,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(940,000)	(845,000)	(845,000)	(845,000)
91-99	Public safety	10,457,000	10,034,000	10,034,000	10,034,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(8,098,000)	(8,098,000)	(8,098,000)	(8,098,000)
91-50	Education	\$13,931,000	\$13,931,000	\$13,931,000	13,934,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(13,085,000)	(13,085,000)	(13,085,000)	(13,085,000)
91-99	Health and welfare	111,000	111,000	111,000	111,000
	Increased pay costs (reallocations) (included above)—budget authority	(111,000)	(111,000)	(111,000)	(111,000)
91-99	Sanitary engineering	252,000	252,000	252,000	252,000
	Increased pay costs (reclassifications) (included above)—budget authority	(252,000)	(252,000)	(252,000)	(252,000)
91-99	Settlement of claims and suits	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
91-50	Capital outlay	18,736,000	Not considered	18,736,000	
	Total, District of Columbia funds	44,607,000	25,353,000	44,089,000	25,358,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority ³	(22,486,000)	(22,391,000)	(22,391,000)	(22,391,000)
	Total, chapter III, new budget (obligational) authority	29,736,000	10,365,000	29,101,000	10,365,000
CHAPTER IV					
FOREIGN OPERATIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE					
91-50	Assistance to refugees in the United States	2,853,000	2,700,000		
	(Cuban refugee program.)				
	By transfer			4 (2,700,000)	4 (2,700,000)
	By transfer—increased pay costs	(38,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS					
S. Doc. 91-19	Subscription to the International Development Association	160,000,000		160,000,000	160,000,000
	Total, chapter IV:				
	New budget (obligational) authority	162,853,000	2,700,000	160,000,000	160,000,000
	By transfer	(38,000)	(35,000)	(2,735,000)	(2,735,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	By transfer	(38,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(35,000)

Footnotes at end of table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H.R. 11400)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference
			House	Senate	
CHAPTER V					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS					
91-94	Salaries and expenses, telecommunications	\$777,000	\$500,000	\$777,000	\$500,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
DISASTER RELIEF					
91-94	Disaster relief	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000	35,000,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
91-94	Salaries and expenses	650,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(81,000)	(81,000)	(81,000)	(81,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)	(500,000)
	Release of reserves	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)
	Total	(521,000)	(521,000)	(521,000)	(521,000)
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
91-50	Salaries and expenses	⁵ Language		Language	
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
91-50	Salaries and expenses	3,139,000	2,573,000	3,139,000	2,850,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(2,139,000)	(2,139,000)	(2,139,000)	(2,850,000)
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION					
91-50 and S. Doc. 91-18	Compensation and pensions	276,600,000	179,000,000	276,600,000	296,600,000
91-50 and S. Doc. 91-18	Readjustment benefits	89,200,000	14,200,000	89,200,000	89,200,000
91-50 and S. Doc. 91-18	Medical care	53,800,000	46,189,000	53,800,000	53,800,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(39,006,000)	(31,395,000)	(39,006,000)	(39,006,000)
	Release of reserves	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)
	Total	(54,173,000)	(46,562,000)	(54,173,000)	(54,173,000)
91-50	General operating expenses	12,500,000	2,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000
	Increased pay costs (including above)—budget authority	(7,900,000)	(7,900,000)	(7,900,000)	(7,900,000)
	Total, Veterans' Administration	432,100,000	251,389,000	431,600,000	431,600,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(46,906,000)	(39,295,000)	(46,906,000)	(46,906,000)
	Release of reserves	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)	(15,167,000)
	Total	(62,073,000)	(54,462,000)	(62,073,000)	(62,073,000)
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
MORTGAGE CREDIT					
91-50	Homeownership and rental housing assistance (annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations):				
	Homeownership assistance	(50,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(45,000,000)
	Rental housing assistance	(50,000,000)	(40,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(45,000,000)
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE					
91-50	College housing (annual contract authorization, increase in limitation)	(4,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)	(2,500,000)
91-50	Low-rent public housing annual contributions:				
	1968	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000
	1969	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000
	Total, renewal and housing assistance	23,168,000	23,168,000	23,168,000	23,168,000
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT					
91-50	Payment of participation sales insufficiencies	4,836,000			
91-50	Fair housing program	2,000,000		1,000,000	
	Total, departmental management	6,836,000		1,000,000	
	Total Department of Housing and Urban Development:				
	1968	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000
	1969	22,836,000	16,000,000	17,000,000	16,000,000
	Total	30,004,000	23,168,000	24,168,000	23,168,000
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations	(104,500,000)	(82,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(90,000,000)
	Total, chapter V:				
	New budget (obligational) authority:				
	1968	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000	7,168,000
	1969	494,502,000	306,062,000	488,116,000	486,550,000
	Total	501,670,000	313,230,000	495,284,000	493,718,000
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations	(104,500,000)	(82,500,000)	(102,500,000)	(92,500,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)	(15,248,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(49,545,000)	(41,934,000)	(49,545,000)	(49,545,000)
	Release of reserves	(15,188,000)	(15,183,000)	(15,188,000)	(15,188,000)
	Total	(64,733,000)	(57,122,000)	(64,733,000)	(64,733,000)

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H.R. 11400)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference
			House	Senate	
CHAPTER VI					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
91-94	Management of land and resources	\$10,410,000	\$10,410,000	\$10,410,000	\$10,410,000
	By transfer	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(275,000)	(275,000)	(275,000)	(275,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)	(175,000)
	By transfer	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)
	Release of reserves	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)
	Total	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
S. Doc. 91-18	Education and welfare services	2,781,000		2,781,000	2,781,000
91-94	Resources management	2,769,000	2,769,000	2,700,000	2,700,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(426,000)	(426,000)	(426,000)	(426,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(1,619,000)	(1,619,000)	(1,619,000)	(1,619,000)
	Release of reserves	(426,000)	(426,000)	(426,000)	(426,000)
	Total	(2,045,000)	(2,045,000)	(2,045,000)	(2,045,000)
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION					
91-94	Land and water conservation:				
	Repayable advance to the Land and Water Conservation Fund	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)		
	Liquidation of obligations out of the Land and Water Conservation Fund	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES					
S. Doc. 91-18	Administration of territories	950,000		950,000	950,000
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
1-94 and S. Doc. 91-18	Surveys, investigations, and research	2,242,000	2,092,000	2,242,000	2,242,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(1,792,000)	(1,792,000)	(1,792,000)	(1,792,000)
BUREAU OF MINES					
91-18	Health and safety	750,000		750,000	750,000
91-50	Helium fund (borrowing authorization)	10,000,000	5,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS					
91-50	Salaries and expenses	123,000	48,000	48,000	48,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)	(48,000)
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES					
91-50	Payment to Fishermen's Protective Fund	60,000	60,000	60,000	60,000
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE					
91-94	Management and investigations of resources	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000	1,353,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)
91-94	Construction	400,000	200,000	400,000	400,000
	Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	1,753,000	1,553,000	1,753,000	1,753,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(1,103,000)	(1,103,000)	(1,103,000)	(1,103,000)
	Release of reserves	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)	(139,000)
	Total	(1,242,000)	(1,242,000)	(1,242,000)	(1,242,000)
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
91-94	Management and protection	2,479,000	2,479,000	2,366,000	2,366,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)
	Release of reserves	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)
	Total	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)
91-50 and S. Doc. 91-18	Construction	1,103,000	100,000	1,103,000	1,103,000
	Total, National Park Service	3,582,000	2,579,000	3,469,000	3,469,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)	(1,679,000)
	Release of reserves	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)	(195,000)
	Total	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)	(1,874,000)
	Total, Department of the Interior	35,420,000	24,511,000	35,163,000	36,153,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)
	By transfer	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)
	Liquidation cash	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(6,241,000)	(6,241,000)	(6,241,000)	(6,241,000)
	Release of reserves	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)
	By transfer	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)
	Total	(8,629,000)	(8,629,000)	(8,629,000)	(8,629,000)

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H.R. 11400)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference
			House	Senate	
CHAPTER VI—Continued					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
FOREST SERVICE					
91-94	Forest protection and utilization:				
	Forest land management	\$25,028,000	\$25,028,000	\$24,374,000	\$24,374,000
	Forest research	1,564,000	1,564,000	1,564,000	1,564,000
	State and private forestry cooperation	124,000	124,000	124,000	124,000
	Release Public Law 90-364 reserves	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)
	Total, Department of Agriculture, Forest Service	26,716,000	26,716,000	26,062,000	26,062,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)	(1,676,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)	(6,932,000)
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
91-50	Salaries and expenses	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
	Total, chapter VI:				
	New budget (obligational) authority	65,136,000	54,227,000	64,225,000	64,225,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)	(2,886,000)
	By transfer	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)	(1,628,000)
	Liquidation cash	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)	(19,000,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(13,173,000)	(13,173,000)	(13,173,000)	(13,173,000)
	Release of reserves	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)	(1,210,000)
	By transfer	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)	(1,178,000)
	Total	(15,561,000)	(15,561,000)	(15,561,000)	(15,561,000)
CHAPTER VII					
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY					
91-94	Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION					
	Manpower Development and Training Activities			10,000,000	7,500,000
WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS					
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION					
91-94	Employees' compensation claims and expenses	15,900,000	15,900,000	15,900,000	15,900,000
	Total, Department of Labor	35,900,000	35,900,000	45,900,000	43,400,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
91-50	Higher educational activities	11,161,000	11,161,000	20,280,000	3,920,000
	By transfer	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above)—by transfer	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL					
91-50	Comprehensive health planning and services:				
	By transfer	⁶ (9,186,000)	⁶ (9,186,000)	⁶ (9,186,000)	⁵ (9,156,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above)—release of reserves	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)
91-15	District of Columbia Medical Facilities	15,000,000	15,000,000		15,000,000
SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE					
91-50	Grants to States for public assistance	651,546,000	⁷ 651,546,000	651,546,000	251,546,000
91-50	Assistance for repatriated United States Nationals	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
S. Doc. 19-18	Salaries and expenses (increase in limitation)	(16,500,000)		(21,200,000)	(21,200,000)
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	677,807,000	677,807,000	671,926,000	670,566,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)
	By limitation increase	(16,500,000)		(21,200,000)	(21,200,000)
	By transfer	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)
	Increased pay costs:				
	Release of reserves	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)
	By transfer	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)
	Total	(288,000)	(288,000)	(288,000)	(288,000)
	Total, chapter VII:				
	New budget (obligational) authority	713,707,000	713,707,000	717,826,000	713,966,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)	(292,000)
	By transfer	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)	(9,346,000)
	By limitation increase	(16,500,000)		(21,200,000)	(21,200,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Release of reserves	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)	(128,000)
	By transfer	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)	(160,000)
	Total	(288,000)	(288,000)	(288,000)	(288,000)

Footnotes at end of table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H.R. 11400)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—Continued

II. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		
			House	Senate	Conference
CHAPTER VIII					
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
SENATE					
	Gratuity to widow of deceased Senator.....			\$30,000	\$30,000
SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES					
	Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators.....			(Language)	(Language)
CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE					
91-94.....	Inquiries and investigations, 1968.....	\$126,900		126,900	126,900
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
	Gratuity to mother of a deceased Member.....		\$30,000	30,000	30,000
CONTINGENT EXPENSES					
	Miscellaneous items.....		(Language)	(Language)	(Language)
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
	House office buildings.....		(Language)	(Language)	(Language)
	Total, chapter VIII—New budget (obligational) authority:				
	1968.....	126,900		126,900	126,900
	1969.....		30,000	60,000	60,000
CHAPTER IX					
PUBLIC WORKS					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL					
91-18.....	Flood control and coastal emergencies.....	25,000,000		25,000,000	25,000,000
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION					
91-21.....	Plant and capital equipment.....	45,000,000		45,000,000	45,000,000
	Total, ch. IX—New budget (obligational) authority.....	70,000,000		70,000,000	70,000,000
CHAPTER X					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
91-98.....	Salaries and expenses, general administration.....	127,000	65,000	65,000	65,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto).....	(233,000)	(233,000)	(233,000)	(233,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(233,000)	(233,000)	(233,000)	(233,000)
91-98.....	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	1,667,000	1,314,000	1,277,000	1,277,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto).....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(878,000)	(878,000)	(878,000)	(878,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)	(200,000)
91-98.....	Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	99,000	99,000	99,000	99,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves (and transfer hereto).....	(262,000)	(262,000)	(262,000)	(262,000)
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(90,000)	(90,000)	(90,000)	(90,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(352,000)	(352,000)	(352,000)	(352,000)
91-98.....	Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals.....	2,833,000	2,505,000	2,505,000	2,505,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(1,468,000)	(1,468,000)	(1,468,000)	(1,468,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
	Total, legal activities and general administration.....	4,726,000	3,983,000	3,946,000	3,946,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(935,000)	(935,000)	(935,000)	(935,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(2,376,000)	(2,376,000)	(2,376,000)	(2,376,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(935,000)	(935,000)	(935,000)	(935,000)
	Total.....	(3,311,000)	(3,311,000)	(3,311,000)	(3,311,000)
FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM					
91-50.....	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons.....	2,319,000	2,319,000	2,319,000	2,319,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
91-98.....	Support of U.S. prisoners.....	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
	Total, Federal Prison System.....	4,819,000	4,819,000	4,819,000	4,819,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority.....	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)	(1,842,000)
	Release of reserves.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
	Total.....	(2,092,000)	(2,092,000)	(2,092,000)	(2,092,000)

Footnotes at end of table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H.R. 11400)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		
			House	Senate	Conference
CHAPTER X—Continued					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued					
BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS					
91-94	Salaries and expenses	\$1,422,000	\$1,187,000	\$1,187,000	\$1,187,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)
	Release of reserves	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)
	Total	(850,000)	(860,000)	(850,000)	(850,000)
	Total, Department of Justice	10,967,000	9,989,000	9,952,000	9,952,000
	Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves	(1,585,000)	(1,585,000)	(1,585,000)	(1,585,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(4,668,000)	(4,668,000)	(4,668,000)	(4,668,000)
	Release of reserves	(1,585,000)	(1,585,000)	(1,585,000)	(1,585,000)
	Total	(6,253,000)	(6,253,000)	(6,253,000)	(6,253,000)
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE					
91-94	Operations and administration (release of Public Law 364 reserves)	\$(116,000)	\$(116,000)	\$(116,000)	\$(116,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above)—release of reserves	(116,000)	(116,000)	(116,000)	(116,000)
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
S. Doc. 91-18	Salaries and expenses (language limitation)	(147,000)		(147,000)	(147,000)
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION					
91-50	State marine schools (liquidation of obligations—by transfer)	(210,000)	(210,000)	(210,000)	(210,000)
THE JUDICIARY					
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES					
91-94	Printing and binding Supreme Court reports:				
	1969	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
	1968	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
	Total, Supreme Court of the United States	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000
CUSTOMS COURT					
91-94	Salaries and expenses	155,850	113,000	113,000	113,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(92,900)	(92,900)	(92,900)	(92,900)
COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES					
91-94	Salaries of judges	2,075,000	1,975,000	1,948,000	1,948,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(1,830,000)	(1,830,000)	(1,830,000)	(1,830,000)
91-50	Salaries of supporting personnel	2,865,000	2,412,000	2,412,000	2,412,000
	Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority	(2,165,000)	(2,165,000)	(2,165,000)	(2,165,000)
S. Doc. 91-18	Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel:				
	Fiscal year 1968	850,000		850,000	850,000
	Fiscal year 1969	850,000		850,000	850,000
91-50	Travel and miscellaneous expenses	525,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
91-94	Administrative Office of the United States Courts	\$141,500	\$97,500	\$97,500	\$97,500
	By transfer	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(87,500)	(87,500)	(87,500)	(87,500)
	By transfer	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
	Total	(97,500)	(97,500)	(97,500)	(97,500)
	Total, court of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services:				
	Fiscal year 1968	850,000		850,000	850,000
	Fiscal year 1969	6,456,500	4,884,500	5,707,500	5,707,500
	By transfer	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(4,082,500)	(4,082,500)	(4,082,500)	(4,082,500)
	By transfer	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
	Total	(4,092,500)	(4,092,500)	(4,092,500)	(4,092,500)
	Total, the Judiciary:				
	Fiscal year 1968	860,000	10,000	860,000	860,000
	Fiscal year 1969	6,639,350	5,024,500	5,847,500	5,847,500
	Total	7,499,350	5,034,500	6,707,500	6,707,500
	By transfer	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
	Increased pay costs (included above):				
	Budget authority	(4,175,400)	(4,175,400)	(4,175,400)	(4,175,400)
	By transfer	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
	Total	(4,185,400)	(4,185,400)	(4,185,400)	(4,185,400)

Footnotes at end of table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H.R. 11400)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		
			House	Senate	Conference
CHAPTER X—Continued					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued					
THE JUDICIARY—Continued					
CUSTOMS COURT—Continued					
Total, chapter X:					
New budget (obligational) authority:					
1969		\$17,606,350	\$15,013,500	\$15,799,500	\$15,799,500
1968		860,000	10,000	860,000	860,000
Total		18,466,350	15,023,050	16,659,500	16,659,500
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves		(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)
Limitation increase		(147,000)		(147,000)	(147,000)
By transfer		(220,000)	(220,000)	(220,000)	(220,000)
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority		(8,843,400)	(8,843,400)	(8,843,400)	(8,843,400)
Release		(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)	(1,701,000)
By transfer		(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
Total		(10,554,400)	(10,554,400)	(10,554,400)	(10,554,400)
CHAPTER XI					
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
S. Doc. 91-18	Salaries and expenses	4,634,000		2,000,000	
NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD					
91-94	Salaries and expenses	298,000	298,000	298,000	298,000
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves		(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority		(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
Release of reserves		(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)
Total		(178,000)	(178,000)	(178,000)	(178,000)
COAST GUARD					
91-50	Retired pay	2,300,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total, chapter XI:					
New budget (obligational) authority		7,232,000	2,298,000	4,298,000	2,298,000
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves		(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority		(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)	(150,000)
Release of reserves		(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)	(28,000)
Total		(178,000)	(178,000)	(178,000)	(178,000)
CHAPTER XII					
TREASURY DEPARTMENT					
BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT					
91-50	Administering the public debt	1,978,000	1,978,000	1,978,000	1,978,000
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves		(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority		(543,000)	(543,000)	(543,000)	(543,000)
Release of reserves		(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)
Total		(877,000)	(877,000)	(877,000)	(877,000)
SECRET SERVICE					
S. Doc. 91-18	Salaries and expenses	470,000		470,000	470,000
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS					
91-94	Salaries and expenses	107,000	107,000	100,000	100,000
Increased pay costs (included above)—budget authority		(42,000)	(42,000)	(42,000)	(42,000)
NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL					
91-94	Salaries and expenses	200,000	200,000	147,000	147,000
Total, Executive Office of the President		307,000	307,000	247,000	247,000
Total, chapter XII:					
New budget (obligational) authority		2,755,000	2,285,000	2,695,000	2,695,000
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves		(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority		(585,000)	(585,000)	(585,000)	(585,000)
Release of reserves		(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)
Total		(919,000)	(919,000)	(919,000)	(919,000)

Footnotes at end of table.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL, 1969 (H. R. 11400)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE II—continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Version of bill		Conference
			House	Senate	
CHAPTER XIII					
CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS					
91-101 and S. Doc. 91-18 and S. Doc. 91-22.	Claims and judgments.....	\$18,188,688	\$16,880,812	\$18,188,688	\$18,188,688
Total, title II:					
New budget authority:					
Fiscal year 1968.....					
Fiscal year 1969.....					
Total.....					
New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....					
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....					
Limitation increases.....					
By transfer.....					
Liquidation cash.....					
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority.....					
Release of reserves.....					
By transfer.....					
Total.....					
TITLE III					
INCREASED PAY COSTS					
New budget (obligational) authority.....					
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....					
By transfer.....					
Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....					
TITLE V					
GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill (H. Doc. 91-50)fl.....					
RECAPITULATION					
Grand total, titles I, II, III, and V:					
New budget (obligational) authority:					
1968.....					
1969.....					
Total.....					
New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....					
Release of Public Law 90-364 reserves.....					
By transfer.....					
Liquidation cash.....					
Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....					
Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds or personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill.....					
Increased pay costs (included above):					
Budget authority.....					
Release of reserves.....					
By transfer.....					
Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....					
Increases in limitations and transfers from trust funds for personal services pursuant to sec. 502 of bill.....					
Total.....					

¹ Also proposes that \$17,000,000 now earmarked for maintenance of real property be utilized for the general purposes of this appropriation.

² Also proposes that \$1,500,000 now earmarked for maintenance of real property be utilized for the general purposes of this appropriation.

³ Includes reallocations under Department of Public Health (\$111,000), and reclassifications under Department of Sanitary Engineering (\$252,000).

⁴ To be derived by transfer from "Economic assistance" appropriations of the Agency for International Development.

⁵ To permit purchase of 1 replacement aircraft from available funds at an estimated cost of \$300,000.

⁶ And an additional \$250,000 proposed to be made available through congressional action to reduce funds earmarked for planning grants.

⁷ Combined under the heading "Grants to States for public assistance" in the bill.

⁸ Also language reducing by \$800,000 the amount to be advanced from this appropriation to the Small Business Administration for loan processing services.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF
SENATOR CANNON TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of morning business on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS
IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which

S. 1583 was passed by the Senate on July 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 1583) to provide that appointments and promotions in the Post Office Department, including the postal field service, be made on the basis of merit and fitness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I move that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to request the House to return the papers on S. 1583 to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Calendar No. 218

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 12, 1969

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to H.R. 11400, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, viz:

- 1 On page 16, line 25, strike out the figure "\$7,500,000"
- 2 and insert in lieu thereof "\$55,000,000".

Amdt. No. 40

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. NELSON) to H.R. 11400, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

JUNE 12, 1969

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

H. R. 11400

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 16, 1969

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. CRANSTON, and Mr. EAGLETON) to H.R. 11400, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, viz:

1 The proposed section 401 of the bill is amended by strik-
2 ing out "and" in line 13, page 71 and by striking the period
3 at the end of line 16, page 71 and inserting in lieu thereof
4 a semicolon, the word "and," and the following new sub-
5 section:

6 “(4) the item designated ‘Veterans benefits and
7 services’ in the table appearing on page 69 of the budget
8 of the United States for the fiscal year 1970 (House
9 Document Numbered 91-15, part I, Ninety-first Con-
10 gress).”

Amdt. No. 42

91ST CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 11400

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. CRANSTON, and Mr. EAGLETON) to H.R. 11400, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

JUNE 16, 1969

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 218

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 17, 1969

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOKA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SPONG, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) to H.R. 11400, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1 The proposed section 401 of the bill is amended (1) by
- 2 striking out in lines 19 through 22, page 71, "(including
- 3 amounts made available to carry out programs to which title
- 4 IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amend-
- 5 ments is applicable)", (2) by striking "and" in line 13,

1 page 71, (3) by striking out the period at the end of line 16,
2 page 71, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the
3 word "and", (4) by inserting after line 16, page 71, the
4 following new paragraph:

5 “(4) the programs to which title IV of the Ele-
6 mentary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967
7 (Public Law 90-247) is applicable.”

8 and (5) by striking out “and (3)” on lines 3 and 4, page
9 72, and inserting in lieu thereof “(3) and (4)”.

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. GOE, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HART, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MC CARTHY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOMY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROCTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SPONG, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) to H.R. 11400, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

JUNE 17, 1969

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 218

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 18, 1969

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. SPONG to H.R. 11400, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 17, line 11, strike out "\$19,920,000" and in-
2 sert in lieu thereof "\$20,280,000".

3 On page 18, line 6, after "grants," insert the following:
4 "\$360,000 which shall remain available until expended and
5 shall be considered as interest earned on the sum authorized
6 to be appropriated by section 108 (b) of the District of
7 Columbia Public Education Act, as amended (D.C. Code,
8 sec. 31-1608) and shall not be considered as an amount
9 appropriated under such section,".

Amdt. No. 47

91ST CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 11400

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. Sproue to
H.R. 11400, an Act making supplemental
appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

JUNE 18, 1969

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed



Public Law 91-47
91st Congress, H. R. 11400
July 22, 1969

An Act

83 STAT. 49

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969,
and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, namely:

Second
Supplemental
Appropriations
Act, 1969.

TITLE I

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Army",
\$110,000,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Navy",
\$21,500,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military personnel, Air Force",
\$146,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Army",
\$96,310,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", \$15,390,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$242,700,000.

PROCUREMENT

PROCUREMENT OF EQUIPMENT AND MISSILES, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army", \$640,100,000, to remain available until expended.

TITLE II

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", for "Plant and animal disease and pest control", \$1,400,000.

EXTENSION SERVICE

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses", for "Retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents", \$218,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

FLOOD PREVENTION

For an additional amount for "Flood prevention", \$4,000,000 to remain available until expended for emergency measures for runoff retardation and soil erosion prevention, as provided by section 216 of the Flood Control Act of 1950 (33 U.S.C. 701 b-1).

64 Stat. 184.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SUGAR ACT PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Sugar Act program", \$7,500,000.

61 Stat. 922;
79 Stat. 1271.
7 USC 1100.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

There may be transferred to the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund not to exceed \$25,000,000 of the unobligated funds in the Direct Loan Account, to be reimbursed to the Direct Loan Account from repayments of loans made from the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Reserve personnel, Navy", \$4,150,000.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", \$5,450,000.

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for "Retired pay, Defense", \$175,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Navy", \$20,000,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", \$3,600,000, and in addition, \$500,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Procurement, Marine Corps".

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard", \$10,000,000, and in addition, \$1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army".

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For an additional amount for "Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard", \$8,800,000, and in addition, \$2,000,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Other Procurement, Air Force".

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia", for the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$10,365,000.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$975,000, of which \$1,000 shall be payable from the highway fund.

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", \$10,034,000, of which \$95,000 for the Department of Corrections shall remain available until September 30, 1969, and of which \$528,000 shall be payable from the highway fund, and of which \$1,302,000 shall be available for the fiscal year 1968.

EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Education", \$13,931,000.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

For an additional amount for "Health and welfare", \$111,000.

SANITARY ENGINEERING

For an additional amount for "Sanitary engineering", \$252,000.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For payment of claims in excess of \$250, approved by the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$50,000.

D. C. Code 1-904.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated herein for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES IN THE UNITED STATES

For an additional amount for "Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$2,700,000 to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic Assistance", fiscal year 1969, of the Agency for International Development, and, in addition, \$35,000 which shall be derived by transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SUBSCRIPTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment of the first installment of the United States share of the 1969-1971 increase in the resources of the International Development Association, as authorized by law, \$160,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Ante, p. 10.

CHAPTER V

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, TELECOMMUNICATIONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, telecommunications", \$500,000, to remain available until expended.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$600,000 of which \$100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969; (and release of \$81,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364). Post, p.83.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$2,850,000.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$276,600,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", \$89,200,000, to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$53,800,000: (and release of \$15,167,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$12,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

MORTGAGE CREDIT

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat. 477), is increased by \$45,000,000 and the limitation on total payments under those entered into under section 236 of such Act (82 Stat. 498) is increased by \$45,000,000.

12 USC 1715z.

12 USC 1715z-1.

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

COLLEGE HOUSING

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with educational institutions entered into pursuant to section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604), is increased by \$2,500,000.

12 USC 1749.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For additional amounts for "Low rent public housing annual contributions", \$7,168,000 for the fiscal year 1968, and \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources" \$10,410,000; and in addition, \$1,803,000 (including \$175,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Water supply and water pollution control", fiscal year 1969; (and release of \$275,000 reserved under "Management of lands and resources" pursuant to said section 201).

Post, p. 83.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Education and welfare services", \$2,781,000.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management", \$2,700,000, of which \$150,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969; (and release of \$426,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For an additional amount for "Land and water conservation", to be derived from the "Land and water conservation fund" and to remain available until expended for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to section 3(b)(1) of the Act of October 2, 1968 (Public Law 90-545), \$19,000,000.

82 Stat. 931.
16 USC 79c.

OFFICE OF THE TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Administration of territories", \$950,000, to remain available until expended.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations, and research", \$2,242,000, of which \$300,000 shall remain available until June 30, 1970.

BUREAU OF MINES

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Health and safety", \$750,000 to remain available until September 30, 1969.

HELIUM FUND

For an additional amount of borrowing authority for the "Helium fund", \$10,000,000, to remain available without fiscal year limitation.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$48,000.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

PAYMENT TO FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE FUND

For payment to "Fishermen's Protective Fund", established pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1968 (82 Stat. 729), \$60,000, to remain available until expended. 22 USC 1977.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management and investigations of resources", \$1,353,000, of which \$250,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969; (and release of \$139,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

Post, p. 83.

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$400,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and protection", \$2,366,000; (and release of \$195,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$1,103,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For an additional amount for "Forest protection and utilization", as follows: "Forest land management", \$24,374,000, of which \$460,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969; "Forest research", \$1,564,000; and "State and private forestry cooperation", \$124,000: (and release of \$1,676,000 reserved under "Forest protection and utilization" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

Post, p. 83.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received prior to September 1, 1969, by each Endowment under the provisions of section 10(a) (2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, not to exceed a total of \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

82 Stat. 186.
20 USC 959.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$20,000,000.

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, \$7,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1969.

76 Stat. 24;
79 Stat. 75.
42 USC 2572.

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION CLAIMS AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Employees' compensation claims and expenses", \$15,900,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Higher educational activities", \$3,920,000, to remain available until expended for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended (Public Law 90-575, approved October 16, 1968): *Provided*, That, in addition, \$160,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act for annual interest grants authorized by section 306 of the Higher Education Facilities Act, as amended by Public Law 90-575, shall be used to formulate or carry out any grant to any institution of higher education unless such institution is in full compliance with section 504 of such Act.

82 Stat. 1038.
20 USC 1056.

81 Stat. 83.
20 USC 1091c.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Comprehensive health planning and services", \$9,186,000, to remain available until September 30, 1969, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$292,000 reserved under "Comprehensive health planning and services" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364): *Provided*, That the amount made available under "Comprehensive health planning and services" in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1969, for grants under section 314(a) of the Public Health Service Act is reduced from "\$7,375,000" to \$7,125,000.

Post, p. 83.

82 Stat. 979;
80 Stat. 1181.
42 USC 246.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MEDICAL FACILITIES

For grants and loans for nonprofit private facilities pursuant to the District of Columbia Medical Facilities Construction Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-457), \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

82 Stat. 631.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for maintenance payments"; "Grants to States for medical assistance"; and "Social services, administration, training, and demonstration projects"; \$651,546,000.

ASSISTANCE FOR REPATRIATED UNITED STATES NATIONALS

For an additional amount for "Assistance for repatriated United States nationals", \$100,000.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON SALARIES AND EXPENSES

79 Stat. 338.
42 USC 401.

For an additional amount for "Limitation on salaries and expenses", Social Security Administration, \$21,200,000, to be expended, as authorized by section 201(g) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, from any one or all of the trust funds referred to therein.

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

For payment to Vide G. Bartlett, widow of E. L. Bartlett, late a Senator from the State of Alaska, \$30,000.

The clerk hire allowance of each Senator from the States of Illinois and Texas shall be increased to that allowed Senators from States having a population of eleven million, the population of said States having exceeded eleven million inhabitants.

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and Investigations", fiscal year 1968, \$126,900.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For payment to Lelia Ashton Everett, mother of Robert A. Everett, late a Representative from the State of Tennessee, \$30,000.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES

54 Stat. 1056.
40 USC 174k.

Miscellaneous items: The limitation under this head, fiscal year 1969, on the payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 208 of the Act approved October 9, 1940 (Public Law 812), is hereby increased by \$36,000.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

House office buildings: From and after March 1, 1969, the compensation of the Superintendent of Garages shall be at the basic annual rate of \$5,270.

CHAPTER IX

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

FLOOD CONTROL AND COASTAL EMERGENCIES

For an additional amount for "Flood control and coastal emergencies", \$25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For an additional amount for "Plant and Capital Equipment", \$45,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general administration", \$65,000, of which \$40,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969, and, in addition, \$231,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, and \$2,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service", pursuant to said section 201. Post, p. 83.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", \$1,277,000, of which \$101,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969, and, in addition, \$100,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$100,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities" pursuant to said section 201).

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", \$99,000, and, in addition, \$262,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division" pursuant to said section 201).

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS AND MARSHALS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", \$2,505,000 of which \$162,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969; (and release of \$150,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF PRISONS

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", \$2,319,000; (and release of \$250,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

Post, p. 83.

SUPPORT OF UNITED STATES PRISONERS

For an additional amount for "Support of United States Prisoners", \$2,500,000.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,187,000 of which \$737,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969; (and release of \$400,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

The amount required to be advanced from "Operations and administration" to the Small Business Administration during the current fiscal year for the processing of loan applications is hereby reduced to \$1,200,000; (and release of \$116,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

In addition to the amount made available in the appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1969, for retirement pay of commissioned officers and payments under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan, \$147,000 shall be available in that appropriation for such expenses.

82 Stat. 679;
70A Stat. 108;
75 Stat. 810.
10 USC 1431-
1446.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

For an additional amount for "State marine schools", for liquidation of obligations incurred for payment of allowances for uniforms, textbooks and subsistence of cadets at State marine schools, to remain available until expended, \$210,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Ship construction".

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PRINTING AND BINDING SUPREME COURT REPORTS

For an additional amount for "Printing and binding Supreme Court reports", \$27,000.

For an additional amount for "Printing and binding Supreme Court reports", fiscal year 1968, \$10,000.

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$113,000.

COURT OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF JUDGES

For an additional amount for "Salaries of judges", \$1,948,000.

SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

For an additional amount for "Salaries of supporting personnel", \$2,412,000 of which \$205,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel", fiscal year 1968, \$850,000.

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel", fiscal year 1969, \$850,000.

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous expenses", \$400,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of the United States Courts", \$97,500, of which \$10,000 shall remain available until September 30, 1969, and, in addition, \$10,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Expenses of referees", fiscal year 1969.

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$298,000; (and release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

Post, p. 83.

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$2,000,000.

CHAPTER XII

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt" \$1,978,000; (and release of \$334,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364).

Post, p. 83.

U.S. SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$470,000

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$100,000.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$147,000.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in Senate Documents Numbered 18 and 20 and House Document Numbered 101, Ninety-first Congress, \$18,180,688, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE III

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1969, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators", \$458,270;
"Salaries, officers and employees", \$1,647,837;
"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", \$21,905;
Contingent expenses of the Senate:
 "Senate policy committees", \$27,190;
 "Automobiles and maintenance", \$2,180;
 "Inquiries and investigations", \$370,640; including \$14,460 for the Committee on Appropriations;
 "Folding documents", \$2,565;
 "Miscellaneous items", \$169,015, including \$100,500 for payment to the Architect of the Capitol in accordance with section 4 of Public Law 87-82, approved July 6, 1961;

75 Stat. 199.
40 USC 174j-4.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

Compensation of Members, \$1,975,000;

SALARIES, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES

"Office of the Speaker", \$4,015;
"Office of the Parliamentarian", \$12,935;
"Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives", \$670;
"Office of the Chaplain", \$1,250;
"Office of the Clerk", \$110,000;
"Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$192,000;
"Office of the Doorkeeper", \$65,000;
"Office of the Postmaster", \$40,875;
"Committee employees", \$400,000;
Special and minority employees:
 "Minority employees", \$11,410;
 "House Democratic steering committee", \$3,760;
 "House Republican conference", \$3,760;
 "Majority leader", \$4,800;
 "Minority leader", \$4,005;
 "Majority whip", \$3,885;
 "Minority whip", \$3,885;
 "Printing clerks", \$980;
"Official reporters of debates", \$27,000;
"Official reporters to committees", \$24,760;
"Office of the legislative counsel", \$25,600;

MEMBERS' CLERK HIRE

"Members' clerk hire", \$3,050,000;

Contingent Expenses of the House

"Special and select committees", \$129,000;
"Revision of laws", \$1,490;
"Speaker's automobile", \$665;
"Majority leader's automobile", \$665;
"Minority leader's automobile", \$665;

JOINT ITEMS

Contingent Expenses of the Senate

"Joint Economic Committee", \$13,500;
"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy", \$17,820;
"Joint Committee on Printing", \$12,425;

Contingent Expenses of the House

"Joint Committee on Defense Production", \$7,950;

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries", \$36,000;
Capitol buildings and grounds:
 "Capitol buildings", \$74,500;
 "Capitol grounds", \$25,600;
 "Senate office buildings", \$174,000;
 "Senate garage", \$6,500;
 "House office buildings", \$300,000;
 "Capitol power plant", \$27,500;
Library buildings and grounds: "Structural and mechanical care", \$28,000;

BOTANIC GARDEN

"Salaries and expenses", \$22,500;

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

"Salaries and expenses", \$579,300: *Provided*, That \$75,000 of the amount allocated for rental of space under this head, fiscal year 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

Copyright Office: "Salaries and expenses", \$109,800;

Legislative Reference Service: "Salaries and expenses", \$170,000, and in addition, \$50,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses", distribution of catalog cards;

Distribution of catalog cards: Not to exceed \$150,000 of the \$200,000 reserve fund under this head, fiscal year 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents: "Salaries and expenses", \$6,000;

"Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)", \$9,000;

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and expenses", \$178,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the \$200,000 reserve fund under this head, fiscal year 1969, may be used for increased pay costs;

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,114,000;

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries", \$120,000;

"Care of the building and grounds", \$15,900;

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

"Salaries and expenses", \$16,000;

COURT OF CLAIMS

"Salaries and expenses", \$64,000;

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

"Expenses of referees", \$248,000, to be derived from the "Referees' salary and expense fund";

"Salaries of referees", \$404,000, to be derived from the "Referees' salary and expense fund";

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

For an additional amount for "Compensation of the President", \$44,584;

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

"Salaries and expenses", \$50,000; (and release of \$355,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

"Salaries and expenses", \$100,000; (and release of \$70,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Salaries and expenses, Telecommunications"; (Release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies", \$30,000; (and release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

"Salaries and expenses", (Release of \$28,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

"Salaries and expenses", \$32,000;

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"Administrative expenses", Agency for International Development, \$1,500,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1969;

"Administrative and other expenses", Department of State, \$75,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1969;

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Post, p. 83.

"Salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$6,615,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

"Payments and expenses"; (Release of \$81,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

"Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses"; (Release of \$135,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$73,000;

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Conservation operations", \$3,980,000; (and release of \$1,000,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Watershed planning", \$254,000; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"River basin surveys and investigations", \$306,000; (and release of \$90,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Watershed works of improvement", \$688,000; (and release of \$300,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Flood prevention", \$224,000; (and release of \$128,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Great Plains conservation program", \$160,000;

"Resource conservation and development", \$111,000; (and release of \$100,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$684,000;

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$527,000;

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

"Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", \$2,000,000; (and release of \$600,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364). Post, p. 83.

"Special milk program"; (Release of \$15,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$362,000, to be derived by transfer from "Cropland adjustment program", Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, fiscal year 1969; (and release of \$68,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Foreign Agricultural Service, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

"Salaries and expenses", \$65,000;

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service", \$4,108,000 of which \$1,826,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Cropland adjustment program", fiscal year 1969, \$1,560,000, from "Cropland conversion program", and \$722,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation Fund; (and release of \$551,000 reserved under "Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

RURAL COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$18,000; (and release of \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

"Salaries and expenses", \$568,000;

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$49,000; (and release of \$64,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

"Salaries and expenses", \$239,000;

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$58,000;

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$40,000; (and release of \$35,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

"Salaries and expenses", \$116,000; (and release of \$9,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$224,000, of which \$36,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Payments and expenses", Cooperative State Research Service, (and release of \$30,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

Post, p. 83.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$624,000; (and release of \$11,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,094,000, of which \$13,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Agricultural Research Service pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, \$158,000 from "Payments and expenses", Cooperative State Research Service (including \$44,000 from the amount reserved pursuant to said section 201), \$2,000 from the amount reserved under "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses", Federal Extension Service pursuant to said section 201, \$150,000 from "Payments to States and possessions", Consumer and Marketing Service, and \$412,000 from "Cropland adjustment program", Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service; (and release of \$156,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses", Farmers Home Administration pursuant to said section 201) ;

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

"Administrative and operating expenses", \$274,000; (and release of \$97,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$293,000, of which \$75,000 shall be derived by transfer from "Operations and administration", Economic Development Assistance;

OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

"Salaries and expenses", \$75,000, to be derived by transfer from "Operations and administration", Economic Development Assistance; (and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

"Salaries and expenses", \$567,000;
"1967 economic censuses", \$285,000;

BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$206,000; (and release of \$36,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) ;

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

"Salaries and expenses", \$200,000; (and release of \$163,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Export control", \$136,000; (and release of \$60,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364); Post, p. 83.

OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

"Salaries and expenses", \$142,000; (and release of \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$3,254,000; (and release of \$786,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Research and development", \$614,000; (and release of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

PATENT OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,240,000; (and release of \$321,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

"Research and technical services", \$1,100,000;

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses, \$261,000;

"Maritime training", \$100,000; (and release of \$99,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

"Salaries and expenses", \$173,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

"Military personnel, Army", \$265,000,000;

"Military personnel, Navy", \$170,000,000;

"Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$45,000,000;

"Military personnel, Air Force", \$267,600,000;

"National Guard personnel, Army", \$16,400,000;

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

"Operation and maintenance, Army", \$85,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$73,000,000;

"Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", \$32,000,000;

"Court of Military Appeals", \$18,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

“Operation and maintenance, general”, \$1,731,000, and in addition, \$1,869,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under “Construction general”, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

“General expenses”, \$1,100,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under “Construction, general”, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364.

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME

“Operation and maintenance”; (Release of \$181,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

THE PANAMA CANAL

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

“Operating expenses”, \$1,085,000 (and release of \$120,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND

“Limitation on general and administrative expenses”, (increase of \$130,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and release of \$20,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,589,000, to be derived by transfer from “Communicable diseases”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$835,000 reserved under “Salaries and expenses”, Food and Drug Administration pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

“School assistance in federally affected areas”, \$16,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$12,000 reserved under “School assistance in federally affected areas” pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

“Salaries and expenses”, \$694,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$1,123,000 reserved under “Salaries and expenses” pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

“Civil rights educational activities”, \$67,000, to be derived by transfer from “Community mental health resource support”, Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL

"Salaries and expenses", \$307,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$80,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

HEALTH MANPOWER

"Health manpower education and utilization"; (release of \$201,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Dental health activities"; (release of \$102,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

DISEASE PREVENTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

"Chronic diseases", \$436,000, to be derived by transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$130,000 reserved under "Chronic diseases" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Air pollution"; (release of \$519,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Urban and industrial health"; (Release of \$492,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Radiological health", \$407,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

HEALTH SERVICES

"Community health services"; (release of \$590,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Patient care and special health services", \$1,993,000, to be derived by transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$91,000 reserved under "Patient care and special health services" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Hospital construction activities"; (release of \$169,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Indian health activities", \$2,640,000, to be derived by transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$214,000 reserved under "Indian health activities" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

"Biologics standards"; (Release of \$114,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Regional medical programs"; (Release of \$67,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Environmental health sciences"; (Release of \$137,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MENTAL HEALTH

"Mental health research and services", \$401,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$801,000 reserved under "Mental health research and services" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

"Saint Elizabeths Hospital, Salaries and expenses", \$1,984,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

"National health statistics"; (Release of \$271,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"National Library of Medicine"; (Release of \$162,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,234,000, to be derived by transfer from "Communicable diseases", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)", (Increase of \$18,147,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and expenses");

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

"Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", \$56,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

"Howard University, salaries and expenses", \$401,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

"Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses", \$291,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$216,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$232,000 reserved under "Salaries and expenses" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Office of Field Coordination, salaries and expenses", \$215,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

"Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$458,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Office of Administration, salaries and expenses", \$233,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$10,000 reserved under "Office of Administration, salaries and expenses" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Surplus property utilization", \$57,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969;

"Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses", \$56,000, to be derived by transfer from "Community mental health resource support", Public Health Service, fiscal year 1969: (and release of \$61,000 reserved under "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses" pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,407,000; (and release of \$387,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

"Salaries and expenses", \$280,000; (and release of \$73,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

DEMONSTRATIONS AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

"Salaries and expenses", \$66,000; and, in addition, \$171,000 (including \$34,000 reserved pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364) to be derived by transfer from "Model cities programs"; (and release of \$15,000 reserved on account of "Salaries and expenses", Demonstrations and Intergovernmental Relations pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Urban Research and Technology", (Release of \$6,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

"General administration", \$230,000; (and release of \$51,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Regional management and services", \$278,000; (and release of \$80,000 reserved on account of this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

MORTGAGE CREDIT

"Limitation on administrative and non-administrative expenses, Federal housing administration"; (Increase of \$465,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and increase of \$1,000,000 in the limitation on non-administrative expenses);

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Education and welfare services", \$2,843,000; (and release of \$415,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Construction", (Release of \$39,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)", (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

"General administrative expenses", \$246,000, to be derived by transfer from "Water supply and water pollution control", fiscal year 1969;

"Operation and maintenance, Indian irrigation systems"; (Release of \$117,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Power systems, Indian irrigation projects"; (Release of \$39,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, schools, etc."; (Release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Tribal funds"; (Release of \$48,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$175,000;

BUREAU OF MINES

"Conservation and development of mineral resources", \$750,000; and \$433,000, to be derived by transfer from "Solid waste disposal";

"Health and safety", \$347,000, to be derived by transfer from "Solid waste disposal";

"General administrative expenses", \$70,000, to be derived by transfer from "Solid waste disposal";

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

"Management and investigations of resources", \$628,000; (and release of \$59,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development", \$8,000;

"Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation", \$7,000;

"General administrative expenses", \$45,000;

"Administration of Pribilof Islands", \$20,000;

"Promote and develop fishery products and research pertaining to American fisheries"; (Release of \$10,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund", (Increase of \$13,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

"Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation", \$9,000 which shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Saline water conversion", fiscal year 1969, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

"General administrative expenses", \$78,000; and in addition \$4,000 to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Operation and maintenance", Southwestern Power Administration, pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", \$668,000; (and release of \$115,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"General administrative expenses", \$186,000;

"Preservation of historic properties", \$21,000;

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"General investigations", \$371,000;
"Operation and maintenance", \$630,000;
"General administrative expenses", \$450,000;

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

"Construction"; (Release of \$998,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
"Operation and maintenance"; (Release of \$643,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);
"Construction of electric transmission lines and substations, contributions, Bonneville Power Project"; (Release of \$1,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"Salaries and expenses", \$298,000;

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$454,000;

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

"Salaries and expenses", \$31,000;

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service"; (Release of \$88,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$9,220,000;

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$3,276,000; (and release of \$270,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$57,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

"Manpower Development and Training Activities"; (Release of \$92,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$313,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

"Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses", \$363,000, of which \$213,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; \$142,000 by transfer from the amount reserved under "Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses", pursuant to said section 201, and \$8,000, by transfer from the amount reserved under "Manpower Development and Training Activities", pursuant to said section 201; (and release of \$50,000 reserved under "Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses", pursuant to said section 201); "Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses", (Increase of \$865,000 in the amount available for administrative expenses and release of \$125,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

"Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses", (Release of \$448,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$152,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364, and \$52,000 by transfer from the amount reserved under "Labor Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201; (and release of \$120,000 reserved under "Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses", pursuant to said section 201);

"Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses"; (Release of \$992,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

"Salaries and expenses", \$180,000, of which \$87,000 shall be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Office of the Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$700,000 reserved under "Bureau of Labor Statistics, salaries and expenses", pursuant to said section 201);

BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

"Salaries and expenses", \$14,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$60,000 reserved under "Bureau of International Labor Affairs, salaries and expenses", pursuant to said section 201);

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"Salaries and expenses", \$21,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$200,000 reserved under "Office of the Solicitor, salaries and expenses", pursuant to said section 201);

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$121,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$110,000 reserved under "Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses", pursuant to said section 201); Post, p. 83.

"Federal contract compliance and civil rights program," \$39,000, to be derived by transfer from the amount reserved under "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364; (and release of \$3,000 reserved under "Federal Contract Compliance and Civil Rights Program", pursuant to said section 201);

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(OUT OF POSTAL FUND)

"Administration and regional operations"; (Release of \$2,107,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Research, development, and engineering", \$500,000;

"Operations", \$195,071,000, and, in addition, \$62,000,000 to be derived by transfer from "Transportation", fiscal year 1969;

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

"Salaries and expenses", \$6,787,000, and, in addition, \$750,000 to be derived by transfer from "Chamizal settlement", International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and \$83,000 from "Rama Road, Nicaragua";

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

"Missions to international organizations", \$153,000;

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:

"Salaries and expenses", \$43,000;

"Operation and maintenance", \$29,000;

"American sections, international commissions", \$19,000;

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

"Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities", \$425,000;

OTHER

"Migration and refugee assistance", \$26,000;

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$100,000;

COAST GUARD

"Operating expenses", \$9,500,000; (and release of \$82,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

"Acquisition, construction and improvements"; (Release of \$51,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Reserve training", \$900,000; (and release of \$40,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

"Operations", \$30,400,000;

"Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports", \$220,000;

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

"Highway beautification", \$64,000;

"Motor carrier safety", \$68,000; (and release of \$22,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

"Limitation on general expenses", (increase of \$875,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses; and release of \$641,000 reserved under this limitation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses"; (release of \$35,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Bureau of railroad safety", \$90,000; (and release of \$83,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$257,000; (and release of \$134,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,637,000; (and release of \$1,550,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

BUREAU OF THE MINT

"Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$425,000; (and release of \$564,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Revenue accounting and processing", \$4,500,000;

"Compliance", \$2,800,000; (and release of \$20,360,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

"Salaries and expenses", \$167,000; (and release of \$85,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,338,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", \$3,671,000; (and release of \$677,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", \$300,000; (and release of \$95,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service"; (Release of \$5,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service"; (Release of \$38,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", \$119,000;

"Administrative operations fund"; (Release of \$107,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"Medical and prosthetic research", \$1,168,000; (and release of \$362,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses", \$589,000;

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$33,000;

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

"Arms control and disarmament activities", (Release of \$15,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,364,000; (and release of \$89,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$370,000;

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on administrative expenses", (increase of \$97,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$970,000; (and release of \$16,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses". (Increase of \$115,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and release of \$102,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation", (Release of \$4,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$90,000; (and release of \$76,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$125,000; (and release of \$8,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$778,000;

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$41,000;

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$818,000; (and release of \$382,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$30,000; (and release of \$20,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PRODUCT SAFETY

"Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$400,000; (and release of \$848,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

"Limitation on salaries and expenses", (Increase of \$516,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$140,000;

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$594,000; (and release of \$299,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

Post, p. 83.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$200,000; (and release of \$265,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

"Salaries and expenses", \$695,000; (and release of \$125,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art", \$30,000; (and release of \$23,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

TARIFF COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", (release of \$53,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries and expenses", \$86,000; (and release of \$77,000 reserved under this appropriation pursuant to section 201 of Public Law 90-364);

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

"Salaries and expenses", \$3,500,000;

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

"Parks and recreation", \$322,000;

"Health and welfare", \$2,437,000;

"Highways and traffic", \$163,000, of which \$140,000 shall be payable from the highway fund;

"Sanitary engineering", \$227,000, of which \$99,000 shall be payable from the water fund, \$64,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and \$1,000 from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund;

"Personal services, wage-board employees", \$3,179,000, of which \$200,300 shall be payable from the highway fund, \$184,000 from the water fund, \$169,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and \$2,000 from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided for, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia.

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

SEC. 401. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970 shall not exceed \$191,900,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations reflected in the "Review of the 1970 Budget" appearing on pages E2993-2996 of the Congressional Record of April 16, 1969, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays), and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That net congressional actions or inactions affecting expenditures and net lending reflected in the "Review of the 1970 Budget" shall not serve to reduce the foregoing limitation of \$191,900,000,000 unless and until such actions or inactions result in a net reduction of \$1,000,000,000 below total expenditures and net lending estimated for 1970 in the "Review of the 1970 Budget".

(b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) during the fiscal year 1970 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise under appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action by the Congress) appearing on page 16 of the budget for such fiscal year (H. Doc. 91-15, part 1, Ninety-first Congress), namely:

- (i) items designated "Social security, Medicare, and other social insurance trust funds";
- (ii) the appropriation "National service life insurance (trust fund)" included in the items designated "Veterans pensions, compensation, and insurance";
- (iii) the item "Interest"; and
- (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)"

will exceed the estimates included for such items in the "Review of the 1970 Budget" referred to in subsection (a) hereof, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

(2) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that receipts (credited against expenditures and net lending) during the fiscal year 1970 derived from:

- (i) sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Veterans' Administration, and the Small Business Administration; and

(ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf will be less than the estimates included for such items in the "Review of the 1970 Budget" referred to in subsection (a) hereof, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

Reports to
President and
Congress.

Notifications
to Congress.

(3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not exceed \$2,000,000,000.

(c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. The first such report shall be made at the end of the first month which begins after the date of approval of this Act; subsequent reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the first session of the Ninety-first Congress, and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.

Reports to
President and
Congress.

TITLE V

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1969, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

Personal service
expenditures,
increase.

SEC. 503. Section 201 of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (Public Law 90-364, approved June 28, 1968), is hereby repealed.

Repeal.
82 Stat. 270.
5 USC 3101 note.

SEC. 504. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1969, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1969, or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: *Provided*, That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appropriations and authority for the fiscal year 1969 as well as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof.

Approved July 22, 1969.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 91-252 (Comm. on Appropriations) and No. 91-356 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORT No. 91-228 (Comm. on Appropriations).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 115 (1969):

May 20, 21: Considered and passed House.

June 16-19: Considered and passed Senate, amended.

July 9: House and Senate agreed to conference report.

JULY 22, 1969

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today signed into law the final supplemental appropriations bill for the fiscal year ended June 30. In addition to providing budget authority for the operation of the Federal Government, the measure removes a restriction that had been placed on federal hiring by the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968.

Written into the law is another ceiling -- on federal spending during the fiscal year 1970, the one we have just entered. This new ceiling is set at \$191.9 billion -- one billion dollars below my own fiscal 1970 expenditure recommendations of last April.

However, the Congress has made this new ceiling somewhat flexible. There are a number of categories in the federal budget -- such as medicare, interest on the public debt, social insurance benefits and farm price supports -- where costs can rise without new appropriation action. Congress has determined that increases in these items -- up to \$2 billion -- will be exempt from the \$191.9 billion ceiling.

There are other outlays such as military expenditures in Southeast Asia, public assistance, medicaid benefits and veterans benefits, where it is also very difficult to budget a precise figure. Any additional appropriations the Congress votes in these categories -- above our 1970 revised budget estimates -- will result in an upward adjustment of that \$191.9 billion ceiling.

There is another aspect to the proposal. If, after voting this new lower ceiling, Congress fails to cut the budget to fit under it, the President must take over and finish the job. On the other hand, if Congress should cut the budget below \$191.9 billion -- that new lower figure automatically becomes a new ceiling. The latter hypothesis does not appear at this point to be a strong probability.

In making the new ceiling somewhat flexible, the Congress has acted wisely. However, the new ceiling will be of little help in keeping federal spending under control if the Congress that imposed it does not cooperate fully with the Administration in meeting it.

Last April I presented a revised 1970 budget to the Congress. That budget contained specific reductions totaling \$4,000,000,000 from the budget left by the previous Administration. It brought the proposed federal spending figure for this fiscal year down to \$192.9 billion, a figure I still believe reflects a responsible fiscal policy in our highly inflationary environment. If we hold the line on that spending figure, as I intend to, and if the requisite revenues are provided, this fiscal year will produce the kind of budget surplus needed to cool off an economy that was dangerously overheated before we assumed office.

Three months have passed since the Administration's revised budget was sent to the Congress. We are already three weeks into the 1970 fiscal year -- and the Congress has not completed its action on a single regular 1970 appropriations bill. It seems apparent that it will not be known until the late fall just how much of a contribution the Congress intends to make toward meeting the spending ceiling Congress itself has imposed.

more

In the meantime, since April, the budget picture has worsened. We now anticipate further increases of approximately \$2.5 billion in expenditure for such uncontrollable items as interest on the public debt, medicare, social security, civil service retirement benefits, reduced receipts from off-shore oil leases, public assistance, and veterans' benefits.

In addition, Congressional action to date has been inconsistent with a number of my proposals in April. For example, Congress has not acted on my recommendation for a postal rate increase to be effective July 1. Nor has it terminated the special milk and agricultural conservation programs as I recommended. Instead of reducing aid to schools in impacted areas, it is moving to increase such aid. These, and similar actions, could add at least another billion dollars net to Federal spending in 1970.

Thus our current estimate of fiscal 1970 spending has risen to \$196.4 billion even though we in the Administration have done nothing in the way of discretionary action to add to our earlier \$192.9 billion estimate.

Given our commitment to hold Federal spending to the April figure of \$192.9 billion there is only one course of action open to the Administration, and we are taking it. I am directing the heads of all Departments and agencies to reduce spending in the fiscal year just begun by an additional \$3.5 billion, the amount necessary to bring current estimates back in line with the \$192.9 billion target figure we set in April.

No federal program is above scrutiny. Some highly desirable programs will have to be stretched out -- others reduced. The dollar reductions will be accompanied by a further lowering of the personnel ceilings established last April.

I know the Congress shares my determination to make the budget an effective instrument against the inflation that has wrought so much damage to the income and savings of millions of Americans. If the Congress did not share that commitment, it would not have imposed this spending ceiling. However, this general expression of support for fiscal restraint must now be matched by specific acts of the Congress.

The Congress should also recognize that if it approves further increases above the April Budget estimates, we cannot live within the \$192.9 billion figure unless more off-setting cuts are made.

I would prefer that the Congress make these off-setting cuts in programs it considers of lesser priority, if it votes increases over my April budget for activities it considers essential. If it does not do so, the duty of making such cuts clearly becomes mine.

